Wm. B. Taylor

THE LIBRARY

UNIVERSITY OF MAINE
ORONO, MAINE

Wm B. Taylor

LIBRARY
UNIV OF MAINE

LIBRARY
UNIV. OF MAINE

BOOKS FOR BIBLE STUDENTS

Edited by the

REV. ARTHUR E. GREGORY, D.D.

PRINCIPAL OF THE CHILDREN'S HOME

THE DAWN ON THE REFORMATION

BY

HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A.

VOL. II.

THE AGE OF HUS

London:

CHARLES H. KELLY

2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD.; AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1902

THE DAWN OF THE REFORMATION.

VOL. I.—THE AGE OF WYCLIF.

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

Always readable, and its matter is as good as its style. Mr. Workman treats Wyclif in a scientific yet sympathetic spirit. ATHENÆUM.

Uncommonly interesting. GLASGOW HERALD.

Thorough grasp, both in spirit and detail. BIRMINGHAM GAZETTE.

Mr. Workman is a studiously fair writer. . . . We may specially note the appreciation of Wyclif as a philosophical thinker. . . . A volume of great value. SPECTATOR.

Singularly clear and on the whole remarkably fair. Mr. Workman is not only in many respects quite without prejudice; he is—what is much more important—remarkably accurate. PILOT.

Has all the value of an independent judgment; . . . it has no pretension, and it is excellent. CHURCH QUARTERLY.

Seizes the essential in a movement and lets the trifling go.
EXPOSITORY TIMES.

At once scholarly and popular, founded on real research, manifesting individuality of thought and judgment, and carrying its message in perspicuous and graceful language.
ABERDEEN FREE PRESS.

A thorough study which might well have been expanded into a larger treatise. BRITISH MONTHLY.

The volume is packed full with interesting matter, and is, of course, brightly and vigorously written. The writer knows his own mind and how to express it. When complete, the work will add greatly to our knowledge of an obscure period of history.
Prof. BANKS in *Methodist Recorder*.

Enriched by the same wealth of reading and the same skill in reproducing its results as his earlier volumes.
LONDON QUARTERLY REVIEW.

THE DAWN

OF THE

REFORMATION

BY

HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A.

AUTHOR OF

"THE CHURCH OF THE WEST IN THE MIDDLE AGES"

VOL. II.

THE AGE OF HUS

London:

CHARLES H. KELLY

2, CASTLE ST., CITY RD.; AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

1902

THIS BOOK
MAY BE KEPT
FOURTEEN DAYS

PREFACE

I HAVE entitled this little volume *The Age of Hus*. The name in itself implies a certain changed outlook of the centuries. To the men of his own day, save in Bohemia, Hus was far from being the prominent figure that he is to-day. They would have called it *The Age of Gerson*, or rather, *The Age of the Schism*. To us Hus is of importance, not only for his own sake, but as the representative of the new spirit of consecration to Truth, as distinct from Authority, which, more than anything else, was destined to sweep away Medievalism. For Hus, as for his master, Wyclif, the foundations of Truth lay in its appeal to the individual consciousness. For good or ill this idea now dominates no small portion of the Western World. For this reason, also, Wyclif and Hus may rightly be regarded as standing in the Dawn of the Reformation.

In publishing this second volume I am con-

223934

scious of the great disadvantage under which I labour in covering ground that in part the late Bishop Creighton has made luminous for us, in a work whose learning is only excelled by its rare judgment. I may, however, claim that my volume, whatever its merits or defects, is in nowise an abbreviation of his. I have made my own independent study of the sources I have enumerated, oftentimes, alas! inadequate and meagre, and endeavoured to form my conclusions before ascertaining the views of Creighton. In the case of Constance, I am bound to confess that the Bishop's account leaves little to add or subtract. When Finke's great work is finished, it is probable that a number of details will need revising, but Creighton's rare judgment is nowhere seen at better advantage than in the way in which he unravels the political complexities of the Council. Sundry sources, edited by Finke, too late for the Bishop to use, save in an occasional note, will be found freely quoted in my pages. I have, in fact, wherever possible, quoted them in preference to the older sources, not because of their greater value, but because they are as yet unfamiliar to English readers.

In the case of Hus, Bishop Creighton's chapters are more abbreviated. Here, I think, I may fairly claim to have written more fully and

critically. If in the previous chapters I owe most to Erler and Finke, for the Bohemian Reformer, I must acknowledge my debt to Palacky and Loserth.

If I were a critic of my own volume I should point out that the work is incomplete, even judging it merely by the narrow limits to which it aspires. One important factor in the Dawn of the Reformation is neglected. I allude to the influence of the Mystics. I had intended, at one time, to devote a chapter to them, and the solvent force they exercised upon medieval faith. But I found that a chapter would not suffice. Perhaps at some future date I may attempt the task. If so, as things are at present, the study must be its own reward.

A critic might also claim that I have no right to close the volume with Constance. Divisions of time are generally arbitrary; but, on the whole, Constance seems to me the real end of an epoch. Any other term has the greater defect of making a gap between two things which were essentially continuous, the New Learning and the Reformation.

The reader will note at a glance that I have given copious references and bibliography. I have done this for a double reason. In the first place, I have striven to make the volume of

service to the young student as an introduction to the study of the original sources. But without abundant references, Hardt or Mansi will deter all save the adventurous. My second reason is this. In the case of Constance, and of the earlier ministry of Hus, our judgment must be determined, not so much by broad principles, as by our knowledge of a mass of little details, often, in fact, the chronological sequence of these details. For these details, therefore, I have striven to give the exactest references. In the case of Hus, I have pointed out several matters over which we are still in the dark. Some detail—some gossip, perhaps—that would have explained an event is now lost, and we are driven to make bricks without straw out of official records and the like. Without "human cement" these form poor material at best. Ecclesiastical historians, again, have often erred, from overlooking the exceeding complexity both of motives and events.

There is one matter to which it ought not to be needful to refer. I have given no references to works which I have not myself used, except in one or two cases specially indicated. Judging from the number of misleading references which I have come across in my reading, I fear that some writers, especially of the cheaper and more

popular works, oftentimes obtain their references, like we buy our hats, ready made, nor do they always fit. The present craze for books without references is also largely responsible for the number of blunders which are handed on, like heirlooms, from generation to generation.

Of the defects and limitations of this present volume no one is more conscious than myself. In such a theme compression is not the least difficulty. I should have found it easier to expand the present volume into one of double or even treble its size. But I am encouraged by the generous way in which critics have overlooked my previous shortcomings. I should be glad if my readers would forward to me any mistakes they may discover, whether due to the printer—that convenient refuge!—or to what Dr. Johnson rightly named "Ignorance, Madam, sheer ignorance."

There are two matters, not strictly flowing from my text, on which I should like to add a word. In the Preface to my *Age of Wyclif* I made reference to the deplorable condition of our public libraries from the standpoint of a student of history. I think I know now all the public libraries of our country. I could a tale unfold. As I have written my pages, and given references to Palacky, Hardt, Mansi, and the rest,

I have realised how useless such references are for the resident in Liverpool, Birminghan, Belfast, Bristol, and other large towns. In one of these towns I recently searched in vain, not for Palacky's *Documenta*—that were too much to expect!—but for Wilkins' *Concilia*! One of the best libraries in the country is Birmingham, the management of which in some respects deserves all praise. But the reader in that city will search in vain for Mansi, or Hardt, or Palacky, or even the *Monumenta Hussii*, let alone other books which it were not reasonable perhaps to expect our free libraries to supply. The shelves of our libraries are filled up with ephemeral literature; the encouragement of serious study seems the last consideration. Popular reading is an excellent thing, but, after all, cities like Liverpool and Birmingham—claimants now for University rank—should not drive the student of history in despair to London. Our millionaires, again, might copy with advantage the example set by their rivals in America.

Librarians and millionaires would probably reply that if they provided these costly works of reference, little use would be made of them. Unfortunately, at present that is true. But the vicious circle cannot last for ever; and the study

of Church History will not always be looked upon as a dead and useless, though perhaps harmless, eccentricity. I wish that I could see signs of its revival in the Nonconformist Churches. In Biblical literature Nonconformists and the Scotch Presbyterians have done excellent work. Surely the scientific study of the Dispensation of the Holy Spirit is not without its value. A theology of the Holy Spirit is the great need of the age. But such a theology cannot be constructed by mere *à priori* reasoning. A study of the conditions under which He has worked, and of the continuity of life of which He has been, under different forms and in diverse manners, the Lord and Giver, must lie at the very foundation of any doctrine of the Holy Spirit. But of the formation of such a theology, alas! I see few signs at present, either in the Anglican or non-Episcopalian Churches.

The gain to spiritual life from a deeper study of Church History would be very great. For the history of the Church is not the dull record of strife, decay, and evolution. Rather it should be a means of grace, the emphasis not so much of the things wherein we differ or have erred, as of that essential oneness of all good men in whatsoever things are lovely and of good report. We all need to widen our spiritual outlook. In

these days of the decay of experiential religion we plead for a revival of spiritual biography, a *Plutarch's Lives of the Church*, a *New Acts of the Apostles*, a *Continuation of the Eleventh of Hebrews*, a series of studies in the soul-history of the great saints, whose differences are, after all, not so important as their agreements:—

I BELIEVE IN THE HOLY CATHOLIC CHURCH,
THE COMMUNION OF SAINTS.

In conclusion, I desire to acknowledge the courtesy with which the authorities, both of the Aberdeen University and of the United Free Church College, placed their excellent libraries at my full service.

HERBERT B. WORKMAN.

Wesley Manse, Aberdeen,
August 12, 1902.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

The Great Schism

PAGE

§ I. Avignon—Urban v.—Bridget and her Prophecies—Catherine of Siena—Gregory xi.—The Return to Rome. § II. The Election of Urban vi.—His Character—The Schism—Its Causes—Results—Clement vii.—A House divided against Itself—Spenser's Crusade—A Savage Pope. § III. Boniface ix.—Innocent vii.—Benedict xiii.—Schemes for Reunion—Gregory xii.—'Water Beasts and Land Animals'—The Revolt of the Cardinals . 1–50

CHAPTER II

The Council of Pisa

§ I. The New Theories—Dietrich of Niem—Langenstein and Zabarella—The Gallican Theologians—Gerson—His Life and Influence. § II. "Conciliabula"—Pisa—The Numbers Present—Alexander v.—The Results of Pisa. § III. John xxiii.—The Council and the Owl—The Books of Wyclif—John's Extremity, Sigismund's Opportunity . . . 51–85

CHAPTER III

The Forerunners of Hus

PAGE

§ I. The Religious History of Bohemia — Cyril and Methodius—Czechs and Germans—Charles IV.—Prague University—Nominalists and Realists—The Bohemian Church—Ernest of Pardubitz—Conrad—Milicz of Kremsier—Little Venice—Antichrist—Mathias of Janow. § II. King Wenzel—John of Jenzenstein—How Saints are Manufactured . 87–114

CHAPTER IV

John Hus and the Troubles in Prague

§ I. Early Life—The Bethlehem—The Coming of Wyclif—Academic Squabbles — The Great Expulsion. § II. Hus and his Archbishop—'No Heretic in Bohemia'—'The Soul of Wyclif'—Wheels within Wheels—The Burning of the Books—'The Pope lies! He lies!'—A University Tournament—'Backsliding like a Crab'—English Lollards and their Letters—Peace with Zbinek—'Yellow Knights'—The Archbishop's Death. § III. The Affair of John Stokes—The Sale of the Indulgences—The Growing Revolt. § IV. The Parting of the Ways—Jerome of Prague—An Unseemly Riot—The Three Martyrs—Excommunication and Interdict—'The Goose and the Snares'—The Letters of Hus—The Attempts at Compromise—*De Ecclesia*—Toils in Preaching—The Influence of Hus in Bohemia 115–187

CHAPTER V

The Council of Constance

PAGE

§ I. 'A Trap for Foxes'—A Long Service—'Failing to say his Prayers'—The City of Constance—Sigismund and the Hohenzollerns—Burgher Reichental and his Diary—Sigismund and his Adventures—D'Ailli—A Great English Bishop. § II. The Schemes of John—Check—Checkmate!—A Pope's Flight—A Stormy Session—'Truly Cardinals are in Great Contempt'—The Energy of Sigismund—Criminal or Scapegoat?—'Baldassare Cossa, once Pope'—Gregory XII.—A New Athanasius. § III. Reformation by Committee—The Struggle of the Nations—Wonderful Statistics!—The Return of Sigismund—A Race for the Pulpit—'Nothing was done'—The Desertion of Sigismund—The Bishop of Winchester's Mission—The Conclave—Martin V. § IV. A Changed Outlook—The End of the Council—A Royal Pauper—Ridiculus Mus . . 189–262

CHAPTER VI

The Trial and Death of Hus

§ I. Gerson and Hus—Sigismund and Hus—An Inquisitor's Certificate—Plagiarism—Hus's Journey—Arrival at Constance. § II. Damaging Rumours—The Arrest—A Scheming Friar—The Safe-Conduct—Sigismund's Attitude—Critical Investigation. § III. Robert the Gaoler—The Letters of Hus again—Dreams and Visions—The Trial of Hus—The

PAGE

Methods of the Inquisition—The Books of Wyclif—The Refusal of the Cup. § IV. Last Letters—The Public Trial—A Martyr for Truth—Farewell—The Final Scenes. § V. Jerome of Prague—His Recantation—A New Trial—Poggio's Letter—'Come hither before my Face'—Retrospect and Conclusion 263–345

APPENDICES—

A. Dietrich von Niem 347
B. On Certain Works of Niem ascribed to Gerson and D'Ailli 348
C. The Writings of Niem against John XXIII. . 349
D. The Election of Urban VI. 351
E. St. Bridget and St. Catherine of Siena . . 352
F. The Fate of the Cardinals and of Adam Easton . 353
G. Nicholas de Clémanges 354
H. On the Works of Milicz and Janow ascribed to Hus 355
J. On Certain Sermons commonly ascribed to Hus 357
K. St. John Nepomucen 358
L. Prague in the Time of Hus 359
M. The Date of John's Flight 360
N. Certain Matters of Dispute concerning Constance 361
P. The Affair of Petit 363
Q. The Safe-Conduct of Hus 364
R. The Supposed Prophecies of Hus and Jerome . 365

INDEX OF NAMES 367–374

CHAPTER I

THE GREAT SCHISM

Constans fides Italica
Firma laus Ispanica,
Laborant omni practica
Ut servetur unio

Fidelis spes Germanica
Laudanda virtus Anglica,
Mote fide Catholica
Ut mater pro filio.

Sed levis pompa Gallica
Suasione sophistica
Conatur et phantastica
Ut fiat divisio.

I. Sources.

The main sources for this period will be found in the well-known Raynald, Ed. Mansi (Lucca, 1752), vol. xxvi., for the Roman side. [Sometimes cited as Raynald, sometimes as Mansi, though the title Raynald would be better restricted to the earlier edition.] As these annals are arranged under the years, any event will be easily found. I have therefore only called attention to cases of special interest. On the French side: Baluze, *Vitæ Paparum Avenionensium* (Paris, 1693) is the best continuous record. Martène and Durand, *Vet. Script. Collectio* (Paris, 1733), vol. vii. pp. 425–1078, gives a large collection of documents showing the efforts on the French side to end the Schism, with résumé in the preface.

The student who may fight shy of the above, should at any-rate read the following:—Dietrich of Niem, *De Schismate.* [All previous editions superseded by that of Erler, 1890, with valuable notes. I have quoted by pages in Erler.] This most picturesque account of his times was finished by Niem on May 25, 1410. For Niem and his other writings, see Appendices, pp. 347–51. A second contemporary, also as Niem a member of the Curia and a German, was Gobelin Persona, who finished, on June 1, 1418, at Bödeken, near Constance, his *Cosmodromium*, *i.e.* "Course of the World," less vivid than Niem, but perhaps less swayed by prejudice. [Printed by Meibom the elder in 1599; also in *Scriptores Rerum German.*, vol. iii., by Meibom the younger, 1620. No modern edition with notes. References to "Ages" and chapters. For an account of Gobelin, see Creighton, ii. 368–70]. For French affairs, especially the efforts of the University of Paris to end the Schism, see the important *Chronique du Religieuse de St. Denis*, ed. Bellaguet (with a French translation), in the *Documents Inédits relatifs à l'Histoire de France.* Of the six volumes of this *Chronique*, extending from 1380–1422, vols. ii. and iii. are the most important for this period. See also *infra*, p. 191. [Cited by vols., not books.]

Two works of Leonardo Bruni of Arezzo (Aretin., see *infra*, p. 46, n.) should be mentioned; the interesting and short *Rerum suo tempore Gestarum Commentarius* in Muratori, *Rer. Ital. Scriptores*, vol. xix. pp. 909–42, written in charming Latin, and his *Epistolæ*, ed. Mehus (Florence, 1741). [Reference to books and epistles, not volumes.] Ciaconius, *Vitæ Pontificum Rom. et Cardinalium* [Rome, 1677, with additions by Oldoin], gives short lives of both lines, and is of value for the cardinals, though chiefly eulogies. Very fine plates of the tombs, etc.

For Spenser's crusade, Walsingham, *Hist. Ang.* (R.S.), ii. 71–105, is very detailed. For other sources, see *Rot. Parl.*, iii. 144–6, 152–8; *Eulog. Contin.* (R.S.), 356; Knighton (R.S.), ii. 198–9; and the monograph by Wrong, *The Crusade of 1383*. Wyclif's denunciations of it form a time-mark in his works. There is scarcely a tract after 1382 which does not contain bitter comments. See *supra*, vol. i. p. 211, and add especially *Select English Works*, i. 257, ii. 166, iii. 242–7.

II. Modern Works.

The best modern works dealing with the whole period are: Creighton, *History of the Papacy* (ed. 1897, 6 vols.), whose insight was only equalled by his accuracy and learning; Hefele, *Conciliengeschichte* (vol. vi., Freiburg, 1867; vol. vii., 1874), a learned and fair R.C. work; and for all matters connected with Rome and Italy, Gregorovius, *Rome in M.A.*, vol. vi. pt. ii., the English translation of which is now happily completed. Other works will be found indicated in the notes. Pastor, *History of the Popes* (Eng. trans., 1899), has hardly commenced. Wylie, *Hist. of England under Henry IV.*, 1st ed., 1898, 4 vols., is of great service, especially on the byways of knowledge. In my opinion, the book would be improved if the notes were somewhat weeded out (printer's errors abound) and mere duplicates indicated.

The first modern writer to deal with this period was L'ENFANT, b. April 13, 1661, at Bazoches in France, the son of a Protestant minister. In 1683 he went to Heidelberg, and, on the invasion of the Palatine by the French, to Berlin, where he became one of the ministers of the French Church. He was there as pastor for 39 years 4 months, until his death, Aug. 7, 1728. In 1707 he came to England, and preached before Queen Anne. [For his life and list of his writings, see preface, vol. i., of the 1728 English translation of his *Constance*, pp. i–vii.] The works of Lenfant are as follows: — *Concile de Constance*, Amsterdam, 1714 [later editions, *e.g.* 1727, are fuller; but I have used and cite the original French edition. There are several English editions; the first, that of 1728, from the 1727 Amsterdam edition, see above]; *Concile de Pise*, Amsterdam, 1714 [so cited; but there are English translations]; and his *Histoire de la Guerre des Hussites et du Concile du Bâle*. This last, by far the least valuable, does not concern us. *Constance* is the best, and much of it is repeated in *Pise*. The three works, impartial, accurate, cover the whole period from 1378 onwards. They have fairly exhausted Hardt, Reichental, and others (Hardt, we should remember, was just published, see *infra*, p. 190), the chief defect being the chronological annalistic form in which they are written. Most text-books, etc., have been compiled from Lenfant, and as a guide to Hardt he will always be of value. As I have made my own study of Hardt, I have only quoted Lenfant where he seems to me to give an excellent digest, etc.

An examination of the sources for the election of Urban VI. will be found in Appendix D, p. 351. For other authorities, see the notes. For GERSON, see *infra*, Chapter II. p. 52.

THE GREAT SCHISM

I

THE continuance of the Babylonish captivity at Avignon was impossible. When, in April 1367, Urban v. departed from Avignon, amid the wailing of his cardinals, he did homage to the public opinion of Europe. Israel, as Petrarch phrased it, once more came out of Egypt, the house of Jacob, from among the strange people. On October 16 the Pope entered Rome and took his seat in St. Peter's, which no Pope had entered for sixty-three years. As the Lateran, their old abode, was in ruins, the Popes henceforth took up their residence in the Vatican, whose comfortless decay was only less complete. It was, however, conveniently near the refuge of St. Angelo. Lateran and Vatican were characteristic of the whole city. The population, reduced to less than 30,000, dragged out an existence of abject poverty and perpetual feud amid the ruins of a splendid past. 'Rome,' said a French monk, 'is fallen lower than I could

have believed had I not seen her degradation with my own eyes,

Roma modo nihil est, nihil est Romae nisi signum.'[1]

Urban, whose many good qualities were spoiled by a yielding disposition, speedily wearied of his exile. The French cardinals never ceased to urge return; the majority, in fact, had refused to quit Avignon. Urban discovered that the conditions had changed since he made his pious resolve. The great Spanish cardinal Albornoz, one of the most gifted statesmen who was ever a member of the College, was dead (August 24, 1367). His military genius alone had made Urban's return possible. The well-known legend is not incorrect. When called by the Pope to give an account of his stewardship, he had sent, it was said, a car laden with the keys of the cities he had recovered for the Papacy. The tyrants he had crushed, the democracy he had controlled, the robber bands he had kept in check, once more raised their heads. In Viterbo, on Urban's coming, for three days a mob attacked the French cardinals with the cry 'Death to the Church!' and besieged the Pope. In 1369 Perugia defied his rule and despatched Hawkwood and his mercenaries to scour the country to

[1] Gregorovius, vi. 454; and for Albornoz, see *ibid. passim.*

the gates of Rome. Urban's fears and inclinations triumphed. On April 17, 1370, he set off for Avignon. 'The Holy Ghost,' he said, 'led me to Rome, and now leads me away for the honour of the Church.'[1] Ere he left Italy (September 5), Bridget—a Swedish saint of noble blood revered for her charity, humility, and revelations—boldly warned him that he was leaving at the peril of his speedy death.[2] Her prophecy was fulfilled. Four months after his return Urban lay dead (December 19, 1370).

'Urban,' said Petrarch, when he heard the tidings,

'would have been reckoned amongst the most glorious of men, if he had caused his dying bed to be laid before the altar of St. Peter, and had there fallen asleep with a good conscience, calling God and the world to witness that if ever the Pope had left this spot it was not his fault, but that of the originators of so shameful a flight' (Pastor, i. 97 ; Greg., vi. 451).

Urban was succeeded at Avignon by Gregory XI., a nephew of Clement VI., a man of good resolutions, learned, but delicate, timid, and irreso-

[1] Cf. Wals., i. 311 : 'Urbanus rediit Annivonem (!) ea de causa ut reges Anglorum et Francorum ad concordiam invitaret.'

[2] Mansi, xxvi. 191 ; *Revel. S. Brig.*, iv. c. 138 (Ed. Hörman, Munich, 1380, in a huge folio, the completest edition). For this prophecy, which the reader may be interested in reading, see Appendix E, p. 352. Bridget went herself to Montefiascone to present it to Urban.

lute, whose Papacy contained but one deed really worthy of himself. Controversy over the renewed Babylonish Captivity was inevitable. Petrarch once more poured out, for the last time before his death (1374), his unmeasured invectives against 'this shameful flight' back to 'the barbarous sewer of the world.' Bridget forwarded new prophecies of death, only interrupted by her own decease (July 23, 1373).

'Hear O Gregory the words I say to thee, and give unto them diligent attention. . . . Why in thy court dost thou suffer unchecked the foulest pride, insatiable avarice, execrable wantonness, and all-devouring simony. Well-nigh all who go to thy court thou plungest into the fire of hell. . . . Arise and seek bravely to reform the Church which I have purchased with my blood, and it shall be restored to its former state, though now a brothel is more respected than it. If thou dost not obey, know verily every devil in hell shall have a morsel of thy soul, immortal and inconsumable.'[1]

The mantle of this Cassandra fell on a nobler, more potent successor. Catherine, the daughter of a dyer in Siena, the Joan of Arc of the Papacy, is one of those beautiful characters for whom Rome always finds due scope and honour. Amid

[1] *Revel. S. Brig.*, iv. c. 142. See Appendix E for further details on this saint. 'This letter was carried to Gregory by a hermit who had renounced his episcopacy.' The third vision was not sent to Gregory, 'because it was not divinely given her,' *ibid.* iv. cc. 139–143.

the horrors of the age we see this maiden of the people moving about like an angel of light. If in her raptures she touches that undefined borderline between mysticism and dementia, in her acts, above all in her denunciation of evil, she has the directness of a prophet sent from God. In impassioned letters and interviews we see her pleading with Gregory to reform the Church and return to Rome. Once she was despatched to Avignon as the accredited agent of Florence to sue for peace (June 1376). Her letters to the Pope are unique in their kind for their combination of rapture and plain speaking. 'You are bound,' she writes in one,

'to win back the territory which has been lost to the Church; but you are even more bound to win back all the lambs which are the Church's real treasure. . . . It is far better therefore to part with a temporal treasure than one which is eternal. . . . You must strike with the weapons of goodness, of love, and of peace, and you will gain more than by the weapons of war. And when I enquire of God what is best for your salvation, for the restoration of the Church, and for the whole world, there is no other answer but one: Peace, Peace. For the love of the Crucified Saviour: Peace.'[1]

As regards the return, Gregory yielded to her persuasions. His conscience was disturbed.

[1] Pastor, i. 105, from Tommaseo, *Lettere*, iii. 173–4. Pastor is careful to quote a letter (i. 106) in which Catherine counsels complete submission to a Pope, even if he were 'an incarnate devil.'

"Lord Bishop, why do you not go to your see," he had asked an absentee prelate. "And you, Holy Pope," was the reply, "why do you not go to yours?" He realised that if he remained longer at Avignon, Italy would be lost to the Papacy. The work of Albornoz was already undone. That great statesman had left the popular governments unchanged, and contented himself with securing allegiance. Now the civic authorities were everywhere supplanted by Provençal administrators or 'Pastors,' against whom the States of the Church were in open revolt. They were led by Florence, of old the unfailing ally of the Popes against the Ghibellines, now her most determined foe. The cardinal of Ostia attempted to crush revolt by the sack of Faenza. The horror of the massacre raised, rather than checked, rebellion. Tuscany armed at the unfurling of a banner upon which was inscribed in letters of gold 'Liberty! Liberty!' Hawkwood was bought over with 130,000 gold florins. Eighty cities joined the League against the men whom St. Catherine denounced as 'unrighteous pastors who poison and devastate the garden of the Church.'[1] Bologna, in spite of the lavish gifts she had received from Albornoz, rose with the cry of 'Death to the Church!' In some places the clergy joined the insurrection

[1] Pastor, i. 100 n.

and helped to expel the papal officials.[1] In Florence a committe of eight—'the eight saints,' as they were called—was appointed to sell the confiscated possessions of the clergy, and to stir up with their appeals hesitating cities. 'Suffer not,' they wrote, 'your Italy, which your ancestors with their blood made mistress of the world, to be subject to barbarians and foreigners, sent by the Papacy to fatten on our blood and property.'[2] To the misfortune of Italian unity, Rome hesitated to join the League. To save her apostasy, Gregory promised that he would return. A few months earlier he had issued against Florence the most iniquitous excommunication ever issued by a Pope.[3] He declared the property and person of every Florentine to be outside the pale of the law. Wherever found, the one might be confiscated, the other seized and sold as a slave. This appeal of the Vicar of Christ to lawless cupidity found wide response. In France the needy monarch was glad to obey. But in England Wyclif raised his voice in protest, and dared to call Gregory an

[1] Pastor, i. 109.

[2] See the letters of Florence to Rome, January 4, 1376, and February 1, partly translated, Greg., vi. 465–8, and original of the first in Pastor, i. 364–7, who corrects the date. From the pen of Coluccio de Salutati, on whom see Symond's *Revival of Learning*, 75–8.

[3] March 31, 1376. For the bull, see Mansi, xxvi. *ad ann.*

'infamous fiend.' When Courtenay published the bull at St. Paul's Cross, he was summoned before the Chancellor, and forced to recall the interdict by proxy.[1] Venice, too, refused to publish the bull, and even protected Florentine merchants in Flanders. The great trading nations were already kicking against the pricks.

On September 13, 1376, Gregory set out for Italy, amid dismal omens and forebodings. 'If you die in Rome,' said the Duke of Anjou, who came to Avignon on purpose to dissuade him, 'an event very likely if all that your physicians tell me is true, the Romans will be traitors, and will make a Pope by force to suit them.'[2] On the first day his horse refused to bear him. On leaving Marseilles, some vessels of his escort were wrecked. At Genoa renewed efforts were made to turn him back. Not until January 1377 did Gregory summon courage to enter Rome itself, protected by an escort of 2000 soldiers. To the pleadings of Catherine that he would dismiss his French guard, and enter 'with a cross only in his hand, like a lamb,' Gregory paid no heed. He preferred rather a crowd of mountebanks 'clothed in white,

[1] *Eulog. Cont.*, 335; *Chron. Ang.*, 109–111. Greg., vi. 472–3 is founded on a mistaken translation of 'Servi Regis.' See Wals., i. 322–3. For Venice, see Pastor, i. 374–5.

[2] Greg., vi. 476, from Froissart.

clapping their hands and dancing before him.'[1] Gregory was wise in his generation. He had a shrewd idea of the things which would please the degenerate Romans, whom Florence had vainly besought to refuse to receive the oppressor within her walls. Late in the afternoon the exhausted Pope entered St. Peter's and knelt in prayer before the apostle's tomb. The building was illuminated with 18,000 lamps. The seventy years of exile were ended; the aftermath alone remained to be reaped.[2]

Gregory had scarcely entered the Vatican before the French began their schemes for return. The Pope himself, who knew no Italian, was not averse to their persuasions. He complained bitterly 'of the pressure of a poverty which neither tongue nor pen could unfold.' He regarded his removal as a painful sacrifice. If peace could be made with Florence, and Italy reconciled to the Papacy, he would gladly return to 'his beautiful native land, to a grateful and devout people, and to the many joys that he had left behind, in spite of the pleadings of kings, princes, and cardinals.'[3]

[1] Greg., vi. 482.

[2] The tomb of Gregory, erected 1584, has a striking picture of the return, with the keys and chair in the clouds coming back, and St. Catherine looking on. See Ciac., ii. 595.

[3] Letter to Florence, Pastor, i. 369–73. For his poverty, *ibid.* i. 375.

Death alone prevented him from carrying out his intentions. In his last moments he is said to have warned the cardinals 'to beware of men or women who give out visions of their head, under the plea of religion, for he himself had been seduced by them, and so brought the Church into danger of a Schism now close at hand.'[1]

II

The death of Gregory (March 27, 1378) found the French party among the cardinals still unprepared.[2] According to law the election of his successor must be held at once, in the place where he died. Gregory XI., as if to ease the way for the French retiring from a city where they might be overawed by the Italians, had issued a bull conferring on the College the amplest powers of choosing time and place of election.[3] But the municipal authorities of Rome were determined that the French should find no excuse of violence for postponing the election until they had left Italy. They occupied the bridges and gates, and

[1] Baluze, i. 1224, with Mansi's doubts, from Gerson. If genuine, it must allude to Catherine and Bridget. But prophets abounded and were widely reverenced, *e.g.* Telesphorus in the French interest, Gamaleon in the German. See Pastor, i. 153–6; Döllinger, *Prophetic Spirit*, 153–8.

[2] I have indicated the sources I have followed in Appendix D.

[3] Mansi, xxvi. 298; or Ciac., ii. 595.

banished the leading nobles. 'A block and a very sharp axe were placed in the middle of St. Peter's' as a warning against disturbers of the peace. In frequent deputations the authorities urged upon the cardinals the sufferings of Italy; only the election of an Italian could save Rome and the Church.

At length, though with some difficulty, the hall of conclave was cleared of the rabble, forty of whom, armed to the teeth, were searching the building to discover whether there were any hole or drain through which the cardinals could escape. Another circumstance, besides the location in Rome, was in favour of the Italians. For the election of a Pope a two-thirds majority was essential. The French, it is true, possessed this. Six of their number still lingered at Avignon; but of the sixteen present, eleven were French, and one, the famous Peter de Luna, a Spaniard. But the Ultramontanes were divided among themselves, the seven Limousins anxious for the elevation of another native of their province, the birthplace of the last four Popes; the four Frenchmen under the lead of Robert of Geneva detesting the Gascons, and determined that they would not have another pontiff from Cahors or Limoges.[1]

[1] See the important statement of the Bishop of Cassano, Mansi, xxvi. 301. A full list of the cardinals for this period,

They would rather ally themselves with the Italians. The result was a compromise, and the election, on the second day, of an outsider, the Neapolitan, Bartholomew of Prignano, Archbishop of Bari.[1] This monk of low birth had risen to eminence through the patronage of the Limousins. Counting on this and his long residence in France, the Ultramontanes now gave him their votes.

The election was not without disorder. All night long the mob had shouted, outside the Vatican, 'A Roman! A Roman! we want a Roman for a Pope, or at least an Italian.'[2] In the morning the tolling of the bells of St. Peter's and the Capitol summoned Rome to arms, while the rabble, 'wishing to drink good wine, broke open the cellar of the Pope.' In the afternoon, excited by their potations and by the false report that a Roman had been elected, they had broken into the palace, but not, it would appear, until the compromise had been arranged and the election determined. But the cardinals in their fear persuaded the aged Roman cardinal Tebaldeschi to put on the Papal

with dates of creation, etc., will be found in Eubel, *Hierarchia Catholica Med. Aev.*, pp. 20-32.

[1] April 8, Archbishop of Bari from April 14, 1377 (Gams, *Series Episcoporum*, Ratisbon, 1873, p. 856).

[2] Baluze, i. 443-6; Mansi, xxvi. 306, 349-50.

robes, seat himself in the chair, and allow the people to kiss his gouty hands and feet until he shrieked with the pain. Meanwhile the Pope-elect, who had been confused, it seems, by the mob with one John de Bari, the chamberlain of Gregory XI.,—'a man from Limoges, harsh in manners and dissolute in life,'[1]—lay concealed in the Vatican, while the cardinals sought safety in flight. But the next day quiet was restored, and the Pope-elect introduced to the people. All the cardinals in Rome gave their attestation by person or in writing that the election was 'free and unanimous.'[2] On Easter Sunday (April 18) the new Pope was crowned, taking the title of Urban VI. On his seal he engraved the words: 'Arise, O Lord; plead my cause.'[3]

No election could have been more unfortunate. The character of Urban, it is true, was without blemish. He had a reputation for piety, justice, and business ability; a master of Canon Law, a diligent student of the Bible; austere and grave himself, he hated all wordliness and simony. Wyclif was not alone in hailing his accession with delight. 'I venture to say,' wrote an envoy to the Lord of Mantua, 'that God's Holy Church

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 12.
[2] See espec. Mansi, xxvi. 312, 307–8, and 328.
[3] Ciac., ii. 621.

has had no such pastor for a century and more.'[1] Nor did his failure lie in lack of good intentions. Urban wisely resolved to free the Papacy from its dependence on France. He told the French cardinals, to their dismay, that he had decided to remain in Rome. He prepared, on the advice of St. Catherine, to break down their predominance by a new creation of Italian cardinals. He would begin the reform of the Church by working downward from the head.

But Urban, who should rather, as a shrewd German observed, have been called Turbanus,[2] spoiled everything, and alienated even his friends by his want of tact and dignity. 'In Urban,' wrote Niem, 'was verified the proverb: "None is so insolent as a low man suddenly raised to power"; as also the proverb: "The poor man raised to power struts about with a swollen head."'[3] St. Catherine, with a woman's intuition, discerned his danger. 'Do what you have to do,' she wrote, 'with moderation, with goodwill, and a peaceful heart; for excess destroys rather than builds up. For the sake of your crucified Lord, keep the hasty movements of your nature somewhat in check.' But Urban paid no heed to these

[1] Pastor, i. 380, cf. 379; and for Wyclif, Vol. i. p. 172.
[2] Niem, *Sch.*, 23, an old joke. See Erler's note.
[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 19, from Claudian *In Eutrop.*, i. 181.

wise counsels. He mistook rudeness for strength, obstinacy for resolution, and irritating restriction for reforming zeal. With the wisest of Popes the crisis would have presented difficulties. The French king and his cardinals, most of whom possessed ten or twelve bishoprics or abbeys a piece,[1] would not lightly have surrendered the traditions and control of seventy years. The tactlessness of Urban turned discontent into rebellion; his insolence gave it justification. He called the cardinal Orsini a blockhead. "Hold your tongue," "cease your foolish chatter," were his common phrases. The cardinals repaid him in kind. 'As Archbishop of Bari,' retorted one, 'you have lied.'[2] A fortnight after his election he openly condemned the morals of the cardinals and issued ordinances against their luxury. They should have but one dish, the rule of his own life. He threatened that he would send them back to their bishoprics. The sermon over, Robert of Geneva voiced the rage of the cardinals: 'You have not treated the College with

[1] Pastor, i. 123 n. But Clémanges says: 'Non quidem decem vel viginti, sed centena et ducentena usque ad quadringenta . . . nec parva, vel tenuia, sed omnium pinguissima' (*De Ruina Eccl.*, c. 14, Hardt, i. (3) p. 15. Cf. *ibid.* cc. 13–17). Clémanges is given to declamation. But cf. Niem, *De Modis Uniendi*, Hardt, i. (5) 122–6.

[2] Wals., i. 382.

the respect they received from your predecessors. I tell you, if you diminish our honour, we shall diminish yours.'[1]

Early in July the French cardinals, 'for reasons of health,' retired to Anagni, carrying with them the jewels of the Papacy. In a series of letters they there proclaimed (July 20) that the election of Urban was invalid: it had been forced upon them by the Roman mob. On August 9, encouraged by the support secretly assured them by Charles v. of France,[2] they issued from Anagni a circular letter calling upon Christendom to reject his authority as that of an intruder and deceiver.[3] A few days later they were joined at Fondi by the remaining cardinals, and Urban was left 'like a sparrow on a house-top' without the support of a single member of his College.

For the moment Urban was crushed. Except St. Catherine, he had scarcely a friend. He had succeeded in quarrelling with everybody, even with those who, like Joanna Queen of Naples, were naturally partial to him. 'He began,' writes Niem, 'to repent and weep bitterly.'[4]

[1] Mansi, xxvi. 379; Gob. Pers. *Cosm.*, vi. c. 74.
[2] Mansi, xxvi. 332–3.
[3] *Ibid.* xxvi. 334–5; Wals., i. 382–7.
[4] Niem, *Sch.*, 28.

But on September 18,[1] he plucked up courage, and issued a declaration of war by the creation of twenty-eight new cardinals, a step which should have been taken, as St. Catherine urged, some months before. Two days later the French at Fondi, with the tacit consent of the three Italians,[2] replied by electing as their Pope the Savoyard, Robert of Geneva. The great Schism (1378–1418) had begun. 'I have learned,' wrote St. Catherine, 'that those devils in human form have made an election. They have not chosen a Vicar of Christ, but an anti-Christ. . . . Forward, Holy Father; go without fear into the battle; go with the armour of Divine Love to cover you, for that is your sure defence.'[3] But the 'armour of Divine Love' was the last weapon in which Urban believed. For Urban, as Walsingham justly observes, 'rigidus erat sibi, sed suis multo rigidior' (ii. 193).

To hold Urban alone responsible for the Schism would be unjust, though the defection of all the cardinals is sufficient proof of his folly, sufficient explanation of the perplexity of Chris-

[1] Date and number of cardinals probable but uncertain. See Erler's note, Niem, *Sch.*, p. 28, and Mansi's note, xxvi. 361.

[2] According to Niem, *Sch.*, p. 24, they were duped with the hope of the Papacy. But see Erler's note.

[3] Pastor, i. 130.

tendom. With some truth it might be urged that the Schism was inevitable. Twice before, since Clement v. had moved to Avignon, had it almost broken out: once in the time of Urban v., and again in the days of Gregory xi.[1] Behind the rebel cardinals stood the same France that had formerly led the revolt against Boniface viii., strengthened now by seventy years of successful enthralment of the Papacy, determined at all costs to maintain this control.

In reality the Schism marks the struggle of the two contending forces of the later medieval world—the spirit of nationalism which underlies the Reformation, and the spirit of international solidarity which formed the basis of old-time Catholicism. The French, Gascons, and Italians were alike all seeking to reduce the Papacy into a national institution: the French, that it might be subordinate to their country; the Italians, on the now growing hope that it might be the centre of a new unity for their distracted land. On the other hand, the old international solidarity of Europe, the consciousness that it was still one in a spiritual headship which belonged to all, because it belonged to none, had contributed powerfully to the bringing back of the Papacy from Avignon. But for solidarity

[1] Pastor, i. 126 n., and especially Mansi, xxvi. 375.

and Italian interests the French cardinal cared nothing. 'I am now Pope,' the French king Charles v. is reported to have exclaimed, when the election of the anti-Pope was announced to him, and the speedy return of Clement to Avignon (June 1379) assured his control. As if to show how little he cared for Italian traditions, Clement formed the states of the Church into a kingdom of Adria, and bestowed them on Louis of Anjou.[1] Charles, on his part, forced the reluctant University of Paris to acknowledge his anti-Pope.

The idea of solidarity was not yet exhausted. We see this in the strength of the Conciliar movement so characteristic of the age. As the old unity of Europe under the hegemony of the Holy Roman Empire, with its two heads, Pope and Kaiser, had broken down, men sought to substitute for it a federation or parliament of the new nations. At one time it seemed as if solidarity would survive under this form. But the divisive powers of the age, as we shall see in our study of Constance, were too strong. The national idea triumphed—appropriated even the Papacy for its own. The French, it is true, lost their hold; Avignon was deserted. But henceforth the Popes were Italians, and the Papacy,

[1] Greg., vi. 520 n.

instead of remaining an international spiritual force, found its centre and fulcrum in the world of Italian politics. From a world-wide dominion it descended into an Italian principate. From this position it has never recovered. Even Leo XIII. clings tenaciously to a local dominion which but retards his real power.

But we are anticipating. The election of the anti-Pope was the triumph for the French idea; their choice was sufficient proof that they were inspired merely by political motives. Few men, even in that abandoned age, were more utterly devoid of all spiritual principle. The new Pope had shocked even the savage mercenaries of Italy by his pitiless cruelty. His contemporaries called him 'a man of blood,' and spoke with sarcasm of his 'broad conscience.'[1] Antonin, the saintly bishop of Florence, compared him to Herod and Nero. History will never forgive his infamous massacre at Cesena (February 1377). This city of the Church, goaded by the outrages of the Bretons who formed its garrison, had risen against its legate. Robert at once summoned Hawkwood and his mercenaries. At the cardinal's orders 4000 of the citizens of both sexes —8000, says Niem, 'old men, boys, and infants

[1] Baluze, ii. 914; Niem, *Sch.*, 25; Pastor, i. 112 n.; Mansi, xxvi. 282; Wals., i. 393, 'non Clemens sed pene demens.'

at the breast'—were butchered and thrown into the wells. Hawkwood, more humane than the cardinal, disobeyed his orders and spared 1000 of the women. Such was the man whom the cardinals, at the instigation of the Holy Ghost, now elected as the Vicar of Christ. To add to the irony, he took the title of Clement VII.

Judged merely as a political move, the election showed the wisdom of serpents. This lame, squinting Savoyard, 'squat, fat, but eloquent,' was related to several princely houses; by the death of his brother, Count of Geneva in his own right, the last of his house.[1] Hitherto known as a leader of mercenaries, he now developed political ability of no mean order. His character changed. From a brigand he became a Pope, dignified, astute. His previous avarice became reckless profusion. His rival, Urban, on the contrary, sank from a painstaking student and ecclesiastic into a reckless freebooter.[2] But Clement could not escape from his false position. Nicholas Clémanges tells us of his miserable life; of his pride, fretting in vain against the insults to which he had exposed himself as the depend-

[1] Baluze, i. 529.

[2] Niem, *Sch.*, 127; cf. Creighton, i. 106, 144–5, who calls Clement "tall, handsome" (i. 73), following, I imagine, Muratori, xv. 920. I have followed Niem, *Sch.*, 124.

ant of France; and of the constant shifts to which he was driven.[1]

The nations of Europe at once ranged themselves into two opposing camps. National jealousies, the struggles of politics, took possession of all ecclesiastical questions. The Latin nations, with the exception of Portugal, under the lead of France, sided with Clement. England and Germany, the latter with hesitation, identified themselves with Urban. So when John of Gaunt invaded Castile, he could plead that he was acting in the interests of Holy Church, as much as to secure the rights of his wife. Scotland, the ally of France, espoused, of course, a French Pope. That Joanna of Naples had taken up Clement was sufficient reason for her inveterate enemy, Lewes of Hungary and Poland, to throw himself into the cause of Urban; to whose side also the most part of Italy rallied, with all the enthusiasm of a new national consciousness. To add to the complication in all countries, there were found individuals who attached themselves to the Pope "from whom," as Pastor remarks, "they expected to gain most." But in England this became treason; for here, as Selden pointed out, "Pope Urban was made Pope by Act of

[1] For this passage (quoted in full) and for a sketch of Clémanges, see Appendix G, p. 355.

Parliament against Pope Clement"—in itself a sign of a new age.[1]

The great religious orders also lost their international character, yielded to local passions, and were split into hostile camps. The Hospitallers of St. John of Jerusalem were divided in their allegiance—there was a Grandmaster and an anti-Grandmaster. The Dominicans had two heads—the one at Nuremberg, the other at Bergerac. The French Carthusians declared for Avignon, so the others chose a prior-general at Zeitz in Saxony. Nor did the Benedictines escape, in spite of their individualist constitution. For instance, at Coldingham, near St. Abb's Head, the monks threw off their allegiance to the king of Scotland, affirming that one who recognised an anti-Pope was *ipso facto* excommunicated. At St. Omer, for a similar reason, an Englishman ran off with the property of his schismatic brethren.[2]

In many dioceses, for instance Liège, two bishops were struggling for the same see—one bishop in actual possession, another appointed by the rival Pope to oust, if he could, 'this son of damnation.' In some places, *e.g.* Forli and Bologna, the people took matters into their own

[1] Selden, *Table Talk*, ed. Arber, p. 87.
[2] Wylie, *Henry IV.*, ii. 368.

hands, and decided, as Hus wanted to decide at a later time, for strict neutrality. The confusion was indescribable. 'Kingdom rose against kingdom, province against province, cleric against cleric, doctors against doctors, parents against their sons, and sons against their parents.'[1]

In Rome itself we have a Pope; In Avignon another,
And each one claims to be alone, The true and lawful ruler.
The world is troubled and perplexed; 'Twere better we had none
Than two to rule o'er Christendom, Where God would have but one.
Christ gave St. Peter power to bind, And also power to loose;
Now men are binding here and there; Lord! loose our bonds, we pray.[2]

Everybody was for pitching everybody else into the sea, as a heretic dog, beyond hope of salvation. In Danzig a Scot, Sir William Douglas, was ejected from a church, the priest refusing to proceed with the mass while one of that heretic race was present.[3] Naples, especially, suffered as the unhappy battle-ground of the contending factions. Each Pope armed pretenders and counter-pretenders, Charles of

[1] Sagan, 62. Cf. Niem, *Sch.*, 37.

[2] Pastor, i. 140, from the contemporary poem of Peter Suchenwirt.

[3] Wylie, *op. cit.* iii. 4.

Durazzo and Louis of Anjou, whom we see struggling for its crown, strangling the unfortunate Joanna, torturing and deposing the prelates of the rival obediences. In one day, so Niem tells us, Urban appointed thirty-two archbishops and bishops for this unhappy kingdom. 'So general strife,' wrote Wyclif, upon whom the struggle produced a great effect, 'as now is among many realms was never heard of before from the beginning of the world.' The Schism, it was calculated, caused in all the death of at least 200,000 people, an estimate, whether exaggerated or not, which shows the awfulness of the carnage into which it plunged Europe. If rival Popes could have had their way, 'the fiend's servants,' as Wyclif bitterly calls the opposing parties, 'would have tried, for love of two false priests that be open anti-Christ,' to 'slay the persons, wives and children,' of their neighbours, and 'rob them of their goods.'[1]

For English students the most remarkable incident in this civil war is the crusade of Bishop Spenser of Norwich, whose exploits against the Lollards we have already noticed. Ghent and her allied towns—Philip van Artevalde's republic of Ghent—had sworn allegiance to Urban; the

[1] *S.E.W.*, i. 115, 257; ii. 314, 319, 401; iii. 308, 329. For the Naples struggle, see the lively pages of Niem, *Sch.*

other Flemings—Bruges and her League—were the subjects of Clement, at anyrate were in alliance with the Clementine French. So in 1382 Urban sent over a commission to Spenser to conduct a crusade against the Schismatics.[1] For political reasons the English heartily adopted the idea: it was part of their long quarrel with France. They could not afford to allow their foe the prestige they had won by their great victory at Rosbec, when the French knights had cut down in thousands the phalanxes of Ghent burghers. Above all things, it was necessary that Flanders —especially Ghent, the great emporium of English wool—should not be lost to English traders. Thus racial animosity, commercial advantages, and religious enthusiasm went hand in hand. Everywhere friars went about preaching the new crusade. As a result:

'The bishop collected an incredible sum of money, gold and silver, jewels and necklaces, mugs, spoons, and other ornaments, especially from ladies and other women. . . . Men and women, rich and poor, gave according to their estate and beyond it, that both their dead friends and themselves also might be absolved from their sins. For absolution was refused unless they gave according to their ability and estate. Many found men of arms and archers at their own expense, or went themselves on the crusade. For the bishop had wonderful indul-

[1] Wals., ii. 72–6, where the bull is given, 'non de verbo, sed effectum.'

gences, with absolution from punishment and guilt, conceded to him for the crusade by Pope Urban; by whose authority the bishop, in his own person or by his commissioners, absolved both the living and the dead on whose behalf sufficient contribution was made' (Knighton, ii. 190–203).

Parliament also voted taxes 'for the succour and comfort of Ghent.' After some dispute as to who should lead the army, Spenser assumed the cross at St. Paul's and set off on his holy crusade.

We need not follow Spenser's campaign in detail: how at Dunkirk the bishop 'killed them by many thousands';[1] how at Gravelines he pillaged a monastery and spared not a soul in the town; how at last, at Ypres, he was driven to the coast, there to lose town after town without a struggle. Spenser returned in disgrace to England, was impeached, and deprived by Parliament of the temporalities of his see. So he betook himself to the easier occupation of hunting Lollards and collecting various versions of metrical prophecies. He died August 23, 1406, murmuring that the earth was the Lord's.[2]

The crusade of Spenser was but an incident in a long struggle between the rival Popes, on the fortunes of which we shall but briefly touch. The

[1] Wyclif in Matt. 152. Wals., ii. 93, says: '12,000, of our side only seven'; cf. Capgrave, *Chron.*, 239, whose estimate was lower.

[2] See Vol. i. pp. 255–6.

cause of Urban opened auspiciously. By the victory at Marino of the Italian company of St. George over the foreign mercenaries (April 29, 1379), Urban was delivered from his fears in Rome. The French, who had held for Clement the Castle of St. Angelo, were forced, in spite of their newly-invented guns, to surrender to the Romans. In their hatred of the fortress the mob tore off its marble coverings, but 'the castle itself they were unable to destroy.'[1]

On the 29th of April 1380 Catherine of Siena died, at the age of thirty-three. This maiden of the people had stood beside the Pope like a guardian angel, throwing his coarseness into greater prominence by the radiance of her fortitude and gentleness. She died of a broken heart, happy in that she did not witness the new excesses, 'like those of a madman and a fury,' into which Urban plunged. Hatred and ambition became the passions of his life. He subordinated everything to his dream of placing the crown of Italy on the head of his worthless nephew Butillo, who abused his position to break into a convent and ravish one of its nuns.[2] To further this scheme, he broke with his ally, Charles of Durazzo,

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 38 ; Wals., i. 396 ; and for the medieval St. Angelo, Gregorovius, vi. 515–517.

[2] Niem, *Sch.*, 42, 63, with Erler's doubts, 64 n. 1, cf. 97 n. 1.

who had seized Naples with Urban's assistance, and plunged into a savage war. When six of his cardinals opposed him, and toyed with the question whether it were competent for the College to appoint a guardian for an incompetent Pope, Urban flung them into an old cistern, 'so narrow that they could not even stretch their limbs.' Lest the torturers at work on the pulleys, 'from morning until dinner,' should relax their efforts, the Pope paced the terrace of his castle 'reading his breviary in a high voice, that we might hear that he was there'[1] (Jan. 1385).

If the chronicles may be trusted, there are few stories in history more revolting than the records of Urban's later years. We see him besieged by the mercenaries of Charles of Durazzo in his nephew's castle of Nocera, coming to the window three or four times a day to curse his enemies, a bell in one hand, a torch in the other, offering in his bulls the blessings of the Church to all who should kill or mutilate his enemies. Charles retorted by hurling one of the Pope's messengers from a catapult against the castle walls, and by the promise of 'ten thousand florins for the Pope,

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 82–94. Niem states that they were innocent, and put in on their behalf a protest too eloquent to be real (p. 84) for one whose legs trembled in Urban's presence. Gobelin, vi. 78, believes in their conspiracy. But he was not there.

alive or dead.'[1] On his deliverance by a mixed company of French and German mercenaries, he hurried across Italy at the head of a savage band only less savage than himself. When the Bishop of Aquila, 'on account of his poor horse and his previous tortures, could no longer ride quick enough,' Urban handed him over to the butchers, who, as Niem grimly remarks, 'belonged to the obedience of Clement.'[2] His body was left lying by the roadside like that of a dog. Historians would have had few regrets if the French among the mercenaries had carried out their intention of taking Urban captive to Avignon. From this he delivered himself by the payment of 35,000 florins.

Arriving at length at Genoa, but dismissed thence in the course of a year, Urban put an end to the sufferings of his captive cardinals. Some he tied in sacks and flung into the sea, others were strangled and 'buried in a stable filled with quicklime.'[3] After four years of further wanderings and excesses, loathed and rejected by all, yet too indispensable to diverse political needs to be put out of the way, Urban was violently

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 97–8, with Erler's notes. Date 1385.

[2] *Ibid.* p. 101.

[3] For the fate of the cardinals, especially of the Englishman, Adam Easton, see Appendix F, p. 353.

pitched from his mule. Two months later (October 15, 1389) he was dead, mourned by none save his nephew Butillo, whose fortunes were now ruined. Even to the last he dreamed of securing Naples for his family; and that money might not be lacking, ordered the Jubilee to be held in 1390. Over his tomb, to-day, in the crypt of St. Peter, we can read the 'barbarous epitaph':

> Here lies the just, wise, and noble prince.
> Great was the Schism, but great was his courage in opposing it.
> And in the presence of this mighty Pope simony sat dumb.
> But it is needless to reiterate his praises on earth
> While heaven is shining with his immortal glory.[1]

The verdict of history is otherwise. He was one to whom Tacitus' famous sarcasm would apply: 'He would have seemed to all men suitable to rule had he not ruled.' Austere, energetic, simple, pious, absolutely without sense of fear,[2] Urban, 'in spite of his constant wars and vast expenses, never committed simony' or abused his patronage, while 'he left more money in the Papal treasury than he found.'[3] Urban was one whom power cor-

[1] Hare, *Walks in Rome*, ii. 285; Gregorovius, vi. 540 n. 1; Gobelin, *Cosm.*, vi. 81; or Ciaconius, ii. 633, with picture.

[2] Cf. the memorable scene in the Vatican; Wals., ii. 67.

[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 122. A passage not in most editions of Niem; cf. Pastor, i. 383–4.

rupted from an upright priest into a cruel tyrant. Even his virtues but threw into more hideous light his cruel excesses. His pontificate is, perhaps, the most disastrous in the history of the Papacy. The curia is not likely to repeat again the experiment of entrusting the control to an outsider untouched by the traditions of the College.

III

On the death of Urban the fourteen cardinals who still remained true to him assembled in Rome. In spite of the efforts of the French Court to prevent an election, the conclave chose as the new Pope Boniface IX. This handsome Neapolitan of thirty-three [1] was a man of defective education,—'nesciens scribere,' says the contemptuous Niem,[2] —unbridled in his nepotism, unscrupulous beyond measure, but of sound judgment and chaste life.[3] The contrast to his predecessor was marked: 'he answered all who came to congratulate him with one sentence, "Your joy is mine."' [4] His energy in practical matters would place him in the front rank of able administrators could we forget that

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 130 n. 2.
[2] *Ibid.* 130, which must not be taken literally.
[3] See the extraordinary story, Milman, viii. 93 n.
[4] Niem, *Sch.*, 129.

he was a Pope, the guardian of a great spiritual ideal. His avarice was not satisfied by the celebration in 1390 of the year of Jubilee, arranged by his predecessor, by its repetition in 1400,[1] or by his making annates a perpetual burden, calculated on a new and triple scale and applied to all benefices. Livings were sold over and over again in the same week, so that there was 'no more trust to the Pope's writing than to a dog's tail; for as oft as he would gather money, so often would he annul old graces and grant new.'[2]

Politically, Boniface is chiefly to be remembered for his final overthrow of popular government in Rome. In 1398, for the first time in its history, the Eternal City recognised the full dominion of a Pope. Thus the centuries of semi-independence and perpetual conflict ended in the conversion of St. Angelo into a Papal fortress after the model

[1] According to Niem (*Sch.*, 170) this was not successful; 'pauci de partibus ultramontanis.' But in Italy there was, at the close of 1399, a profound outburst for a few months of religious excitement. Flagellants moved everywhere, clad in white (Bianchi). See Creighton, i. 165–6.

[2] On this matter, see Gob. Pers. *Cosm.*, vi. 84–7; Niem, *Sch.*, 130–8. Niem, *ib.* 178, tells us that it was publicly debated whether the Pope could not, without simony, sell benefices. Cf. Albert Engelschalk of Prague, *Aureum Speculum Papæ*, p. 81. [In Brown, *Fascic*, ii. 63–101,] and for the practical working of the system, *ibid.* 70; Niem, *De Necess. Ref.* in Hardt, i. (5) 282–5.

of Avignon.[1] Boniface died quietly in the Vatican (Oct. 2, 1404), master of the entire states of the Church. To the last, 'though shaken with horrible tortures,'—calculus racked him,—'he did not cease from his thirst for gold.'[2] But with Boniface gold was but a means to an end. He was the first Pope to discern clearly the policy, which ruled the fifteenth century, of securing for the Papacy "a firm territorial basis in Italy itself" (Creighton, i. 112).

Boniface was succeeded by Innocent VII., an old man of sixty-five. This Neapolitan—the third in recent years, for only by the support of Naples could the Popes at Rome maintain themselves against their rivals—had been a collector of first-fruits in England, and treasurer to Urban VI. He had obtained some renown 'by his experience in law cases in the Curia, his skill in singing and writing, and his knowledge of letters,' characteristics which of course appeal to Niem.[3] He was extolled by contemporaries—for instance, by Aretino

[1] Niem, *Sch.*, 142, with Erler's note.

[2] Gobelin, *Cosm.*, vi. 87. Read all the chapter. Gobelin hated Boniface as much as he flattered Urban. For a bitter comment of Dietrich Vrie—'Bonifacius IX. qui avaritia illectus totam fœdavit Christianam dignitatem'—see Hardt, i. (1) 179. For Vrie and his work, see *infra*, 190, 192.

[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 197, who thus reverses the severe judgment in his earlier *Nemus Unionis*, vi. c. 39.

—as a lover of peace, free from avarice, 'an ardent enemy of vice, worthy of the name he bears.' Innocent scarcely deserved these praises. His virtues were rather "the negative virtues which accompany an indolent disposition." They seemed positive merely from the contrast presented with the greed and despotism of his predecessor. In reality, Innocent was too "devoid of intellect, conscience, or energy to excel" even in crime.[1]

In France the Popes at Avignon seemed a fixture, in spite of their litanies for peace, and large indulgences for those who took part in them On the death of Clement VII. (Sept. 16, 1394) the University of Paris sought to heal the Schism by preventing the election of a new Pope. Their efforts were thwarted by national jealousies and the self-interest of the Avignon cardinals. They hastened to elect the able, learned, but obstinate Spaniard Peter de Luna, better known as the anti-Pope Benedict XIII.[2] The cardinals saved appearances by an oath that whoever was elected should bring the Schism to an end, a promise

[1] Creighton, i. 197 ; Gregorovius, vi. 583. For the irreverence of the age, see the incident mentioned by Creighton, i. 198.

[2] According to *Chronique St. Denis*, ii. 188–203, knowing the purport of the two letters of Charles VI., they would not open the door to the messenger until after the election was made.

skilfully phrased with loopholes of escape, which the astute Spaniard was not slow to perceive.[1] 'I am as ready,' he had said to a deputation of the University, 'to resign my office as to take off this cap.' But Benedict was not long before he showed his true colours. 'Let the king of France issue what ordinances he will,' he said to Peter D'Ailli,[2] 'I will cling to my title until I die.' This promise was one that he kept. Boniface, on his part, did not beat about the bush. 'My good children,' he said to an anxious deputation of Romans, 'Pope I am, and Pope I will remain.' It seemed as if the Schism were hopeless, as if Western Christianity were henceforth committed to two Popes and two rival courts. "Despair took possession of many upright minds. The Schism seemed an evil from which there was no escape, a labyrinth from which no outlet could be found."[3]

[1] Hardt, i. (2) 17–8; Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 62, 63.

[2] For the value of this incident, see Creighton, i. 157 n.; and for full references on a complicated and profitless historical puzzle, Niem, *Sch.*, 180–182, with Erler's notes; Hefele, vi. 703–27.

[3] Pastor, i. 172. See Gerson's sermon (May 20, 1403), *Opera*, ii. 17–24. "An ill wind," etc. Scotland owes to the Schism the founding of her first University, St. Andrews (1411–3), by Benedict, who was frightened lest the Scots should go to Oxford, and thus be seduced to his rival.

Yet escape must be found if Latin Christianity was to be saved. The effects of 'the horrible monster of division in the Church' were disastrous and manifest to all. Clement could not call Urban a 'Mahound,' or Urban retort by dubbing Clement 'a child of everlasting damnation,' without Europe losing all reverence for the Papacy. Wyclif might go too far in the bitter hatred with which he attacked the Papacy as an institution, but his polemic, at anyrate, reflected the prevailing contempt. We see this in Whitsuntide miracle plays entertaining the folk with pictures of rival Popes flaming 'hard and hot' in hell. At a great National Council in Paris a speaker suggested that the rival vicars of God should be pitted against each other, the loser to be drowned and the winner burnt.[1] The Schism had stripped from the Papacy that mystic veil which had hitherto screened it from the searching gaze of the vulgar. Unfortunately such language made it impossible for either of the rivals to retire with dignity. Each felt that they were maintaining against an evil generation the claims of their sacred office.

If the rivals had looked deeper, they would have discovered that Europe was learning the lesson how to do without a Pope altogether.

[1] Wylie, *Henry IV.*, iii. 5, 6, 21.

Not only did individual cities subtract their obedience from both Popes, but from 1398 to 1403 the French got on 'with the sweet Jesus for our true Pope and chief of the Church, and the very sweet Virgin Mary for acting Popess.' Even Gerson, the pillar of orthodoxy, could lay down that 'it is possible to be saved without a Pope.'[1] Meanwhile the French king besieged Benedict in Avignon, kept him there a virtual prisoner for years, then repented of his sin, and restored France to his 'obedience.'[2] But the French had not the same interest as of old in maintaining a Spanish Pope: as well an Italian in the Vatican as a Spaniard in Avignon. So in January 1408 it was once more resolved that unless the Schism was ended by Ascension Day, the obedience of France should a second time be subtracted.[3]

The Schism also stiffened national resistance to

[1] 'Quod si canones oppositum sanxerunt, Lex divina non dissonat: nam ex dicto, potest absque Papa mortali stare salus.' *Op. Gerson*, ii. 72 (preached before Pope Benedict at Tarascon, on the day of the Circumcision, 1404). But cf. *ibid.* 224 and 435 for qualifications. For similar views of Dietrich Vrie, see Hardt, i. (1) 31–4.

[2] For this difficult incident, with its wheels within wheels, see Creighton, i. 146–181; Hefele, vi. 727–53.

[3] Declaration in Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 203–6. Resolved on January 12, but not published until May 22. See also Martène, *Coll.*, vii. 770.

Papal extortion. The old exactions of Rome had been notorious. They were more than doubled by a double Papacy and double Curias, as well as by the expense of the civil war between the two. Both Popes expended much ingenuity in the discovery of new pretexts and methods of taxation. In France the six and thirty wolves of Avignon grasped every benefice, and crushed the local clergy with demands of tenths. The civil power was driven to the rescue. In the days before the Schism France sent the Papacy 1,800,000 florins a year. By royal decree the contributions were reduced to *nil*; while the Parliament of Paris abolished annates and other 'exactions of the Roman See.' A more vigorous Statute of Provisors in 1390 was the answer of England to the extortions of Boniface.

At this juncture the great University of Paris came forward as the leader of Christendom in the effort for unity. In 1394 she invited her members to send in written opinions as to the best method of ending the Schism. For answer, ten thousand documents were dropped into the locked chest of St. Mathurin. These were examined by a commission formed from the faculties. They reported a threefold option: either the voluntary retirement of both Popes [*cessio*], a legal decision by a commission selected

by the two Popes [*compromissio*], or an appeal on the whole question to a General Council.[1] For the present the choice of the University was the first, as the least revolutionary. Such voluntary retirement would pave the way for a fresh election which both "obediences" would acknowledge.

The death of Innocent VII. (November 16, 1406) seemed to bring that idea within the range of practical politics. The conclave announced to the envoys of Florence that they did not propose to elect a Pope so much as a commissioner for restoring the unity of the Church.[2] They bound themselves by an oath, as the French had done at the election of Benedict, that whoever was chosen should resign his office whenever the anti-Pope did the same, or died. Meanwhile no new cardinals were to be created until after an interval of fifteen months,[3] 'except for the sake of equalising their numbers with the number of the perverted College of anti-cardinals' (Mansi, xxvii. 160).

The College gave further evidence of their desires by electing a cardinal 'of great integrity of life and character, learned moreover in the

[1] *Op. Gerson*, i. p. viii. Compare also *ibid.* ii. 76, *Acta quædam de Schismate tollendo* (1406).

[2] Aretin. *Comment.*, 925.

[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 206–209; Aretin. *Ep.*, ii. 3. Cf. Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 162, and for Benedict XIII., *supra*.

Scriptures,' who 'satisfied' Aretino 'in all things save in the matter of the union of the Church.' But this last disappointment was as yet unrevealed. If age was any guarantee of unworldliness, the conclave was wise in its choice. The new Pope, a Venetian, Angelo Corario [1] by name, was an old man of eighty, 'tall, but thin and worn,' who seemed in fact 'but spirit in skin and bones.' The one mark of senility was his love of sugar, on which 'he spent more than his predecessors on food and clothing.' But his 'simple nature,' easily led, 'easily deceived,' had, however, the customary obstinacy of feeble-mindedness.[2]

At the conclave the talk of Corario was of nothing but unity. 'His only fear was lest he should not live to accomplish the holy work.' To speed this he would hasten over sea and land: if by sea, if need be in a fishing boat; if by land, with a pilgrim's staff.[3] After his election he wrote to the anti-Pope in the same strain. 'Let us both arise,' he said, 'and come together into one desire for unity.' [4] The mother before Solomon

[1] So spelt on his tomb, Ciac., ii. 760.

[2] Aretin. *Ep.*, ii. 17. Elected November 30, 1406. For his age, Niem, *Sch.*, 205; Wylie, iii. 17 n. 7.

[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 151; Mansi, xxvii. 161; Wilkins, iii. 296; Aretin. *Ep.*, ii. 3.

[4] This letter is in Vrie, Hardt, i. (1) 136, Dec. 11, 1406. Vrie gives other letters.

should be their example. To save her son's life she had ceased to be a mother.[1] This they should do for the Church.[2] The answer of Benedict[3] appeared to be to the same effect. So the two Popes agreed to meet at Savona, by November at latest. But neither Gregory nor Benedict were really in earnest. Gregory—Errorius, as the angry Niem calls him throughout his narrative—had fallen under the control of his nephews. They had astutely consented to Savona as the place of meeting, because they knew that the place was impossible. A meeting there would have been under the control of France. Benedict, on his part, replied to an embassy of the French king with banquets of wine and spice, excuses of the toothache, or eloquent addresses which made learned theologians weep, but ingeniously evaded any promise on the point at issue.

The business incapacity of Gregory was notorious. Cases came into the Curia for settlement at the rate of 2000 a week. Gregory refused to allow others to deal with them, stuffed them away in a bag, and attended to a few only, picked

[1] This child figures in the picture of Gregory, Hardt, iv. 239.

[2] Niem, *Sch.*, 209–211. From the pen of Leonardo Bruni of Arezzo (Aretinus), see Aretin. *Ep.* ii. 4. For Bruni, one of the early Humanists (1370–1444), see Symond's *Age of the Despots*, ii. 216; Pastor, i. 170–1; Creighton, i. 377–9.

[3] Niem, *Sch.*, 211–14; Lab., xv. 1082–5.

at random. But in the management of his own affairs he proved himself a skilled diplomatist. He first discovered twenty-two reasons why he could not go to Savona. 'I will give peace to the Church,' he sobbed to the French envoys, 'but Savona must be changed.'[1] He feared lest he should be kidnapped by the galleys of his rival, or the power of France. He kept on 'singing the same song,' until their patience was exhausted and the envoys left the city in disgust. Both Popes said an irreverent knight ought to be pitched into the fire. Both Popes, however, still made a show of anxiety for the proposed conference. Gregory suggested Pisa, set off from Rome, and got as far as Lucca; while Benedict journeyed to Savona. From these two retreats the two representatives of Christ, 'like schoolboys, played duck and drake'[2] with each other, wearying out the general patience with embassies and negotiations.[3] 'Ours, like a land beast, was afraid to approach the shore; the other, like a water beast, shuddered at leaving the waves.'[4] Meanwhile Europe looked on impotent, warning

[1] Mansi, xxvii. 172, 176, 187; Niem, *Sch.*, 162.

[2] Aretin. *Com.*, in Murat., xix. 926.

[3] A concise official summary, read at Pisa on April 24, is given, Lab., xv. 1187–1212, abridged in Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 261–8.

[4] Aretin. *Com.*, in Murat., xix. 926.

both that if union were not speedily restored, she would do without a Pope until the Schism was healed.

Matters came to a head when Gregory announced his intention, in spite of his promises at his election, of creating four new cardinals. Gregory's cardinals at once revolted; and after 'huge jars and open wranglings,'[1] nine of them fled to Pisa. There, on May 13, 1408, seven of the cardinals drew up a formal appeal to a General Council. They appealed, they said, throwing the net wide that they might avoid technical difficulties, 'from a Pope ill informed to a Pope better informed, from the Pope to Jesus Christ, to an Ecumenical Council, whose province it is to judge sovereign pontiff, and lastly, to a future

[1] Scene described, Aretin. *Ep.*, ii. 21; cf. Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 192–5, May 8, 1408. One of the new cardinals was Philip Repyngdon (*supra*, Vol. i. p. 232), another Gregory's nephew, afterwards Pope Eugenius IV. They were created at Siena, September 18, 1408. A third was the famous Dominican preacher, John Dominic of Ragusa, upon whom contemporary writers laid the chief blame for prolonging the Schism. In a characteristic squib of the day Satan thanked him for his services, and promised him the hottest place in hell, between Arius and Muhammad. [Niem, *Nemus Unionis*, pp. 341–3. On this letter, see Erler, *Leben Nieheim*, 439–445, and Finke, *Forschungen*, 154. For this man, pious but narrow, see Pastor, i. 49–50. A list of his works will be found in Ciaconius, ii. 763–4. Milman, viii. 104, mistakes squibs for history.]

Pope who shall redress the evils wrought by his predecessors' (Lab., xv. 1179–82).

The moment of the appeal was favourable. Matters recently had fared ill with Benedict after the assassination of his protector, the Duke of Orleans (November 23, 1407). The University of Paris, regaining its old power, had threatened once more the withdrawal of obedience. Benedict retorted with bulls of excommunication and interdict (May 14, 1408). The bull was torn to shreds by the University, and Benedict 'publicly declared convicted of heresy and Schism.' Fearing for the consequences, the anti-Pope 'bolted suddenly,' with four cardinals, to his native Aragon, taking with him, packed up in bales, a thousand volumes from the great papal library; for, as Clémanges, his secretary and librarian, tells us, 'he was a keen collector of fine books.' The rest of his cardinals joined Gregory's cardinals at Pisa, and thence issued a joint manifesto summoning a General Council, to meet at Pisa on March 25, 1409.[1] Benedict also summoned a General

[1] Wylie, iii. 344; Lenfant, i. 213; Creighton, i. 223. Strictly speaking, the cardinals of each obedience summoned a separate Council, which, however, met as a single body, a device repeated later at Constance: Gregory's cardinals on June 24, from Leghorn (Lab., xv. 1159–65; Gob. *Cosm.*, vi. c. 88), for May 29; Benedict's cardinals, from Leghorn, on July 14, for March 25 (Lab., xv. 1152–9).

Council, to meet at Perpignan on November 1, 1408;[1] while Gregory, not to be outdone, summoned, from his retreat at Rimini, a General Council, to meet 'in the Province of Aquileia, or the ex-archate of Ravenna,' at Whitsuntide 1409.[2]

[1] Mansi, *Sup. Lab.*, iii. 813–9, June 15, 1409, from Port Vendres. He entered Perpignan, July 31.

[2] Niem, *Nemus Unionis*, 397.

CHAPTER II

THE COUNCIL OF PISA

Papa, stupor mundi cecedit, secum cecidere
Coelica templa, mea membra, simulque caput
Papa dolor! mundique pudor! per crebra patescit
Crimina, seu scelera, famine sonifero!
Heu Simon regnat, per munera quaeque reguntur;
Judiciumque pium gaza nefanda vetat.
Curia papalis fovet omnia scandala mundi:
Delubra sacra facit, perfiditate, forum.
Ordo sacer, baptisma sacrum, cum chrismate sancto,
Venduntur turpi conditione foro.
Aurea quae quondam fuit, hinc argentea, Papae
Curia, procedit deteriore modo.
Ferrea dehinc facta, dura cervice quievit
Tempore non modico. Sed modo facta lutum.
Postque lutum, quid deterius solet esse? Recordor,
Stercus. Et in tali curia tota sedit.

Poem of Vrie, 1416 (Hardt, i. pt. i. p. 11).

The *Plenissima Acta Concilii Pisani* will be found in HARDT, ii. 62–159 ; (see *infra*) : MANSI ; MARTÈNE and DURAND, *Collectio*, vii. 1078–1132 ; or, better and fuller, in delightful type, in LABBE'S *Concilia* [ed. Colet, Venice, 1731, with the additions of Baluze, Harduin, Raynald, etc.], vol. xv. pp. 1123–1378, together with the large additions in MANSI, *Conciliorum Supplementum*, vol. iii. (Lucca, 1748, cited as "*Supl. Lab.*"). I have not been able to see G. Erler's *Zur Geschichte des Pisanischen Concils* (Leipzig, 1884). NIEM'S *De Schismate* ceases to be of much service.

For the controversial literature of the Conciliar movement, see the notes. For Gerson, see *Opera Omnia* (Antwerp, 1706), ed. Ellies du Pin, or DUPIN, 5 vols. [Vol. v. is almost wholly taken up with the Petit affair (*infra*, p. 238) ; vol. iii. contains Gerson's *Mystical Works* and sermons ; vol. iv., his *Harmony of the Gospels* and tractate on the *Magnificat*. Vols. i. and ii. are the most important, and contain the Conciliar literature imputed to Gerson and D'Ailli. Vol. i. contains also DUPIN'S *Gersoniana*, with lives, both short and longer, of Gerson, D'Ailli, and Clémanges.] In view of later criticism, the work needs care. Many of the treatises it contains are also in Hardt. For the life of Gerson there is the critical study by SCHWAB, *Johannes Gerson* (Würzburg, 1859), and the ultramontane A. L. MASSON, *Jean Gerson* (1894) ; uncritical and special pleading, with stress on the devotional side—*Imitatio Christi*, etc. (see *infra*, p. 65).

For the interval between Pisa and Constance and the negotiations of Sigismund, I have followed FINKE, *Acta Const.* MANSI, *Conc. Supplement.*, iii., contains a large number of documents on this period, and gives many of those in B. DU CHASTENET, *Nouvelle Histoire du Concile du Constance* (Paris, 1718), a sort of French supplement or rival to Lenfant. MANSI'S *Conc. Supplement.*, in fact, renders the use of D'ACHERY, *Spicilegium*, MARTÈNE and DURAND, etc., almost needless, so far as the Councils are concerned.

THE COUNCIL OF PISA

I

THE importance of the era which began at Pisa and ended with the Council of Constance [1] cannot be overestimated. Its success would have changed the history of the Church; its failure made the Reformation inevitable. In more ways than one the Conciliar idea was the outcome of the times. It was the age of the birth of Parliaments and representative government. This was an attempt to apply the same principles to the Church. It was the age of the birth of the new nations, who were yet conscious of the value of the old internationalism they were destroying, to the shreds of which—the Holy Roman Empire and the like—they still clung. Both ideas were to receive place in the new scheme. The national element would form the basis and controlling

[1] A critic may object that for Constance I should write Basel. But the battle of the Conciliar idea was fought and lost at Constance, and by the time of Basel Europe had really turned to other interests. See *infra*, pp. 261 and 344.

element in the international doctorate; this last should form the true unifying bond amid the struggles of the nations. The impasse of circumstance was on the side of the idea. There seemed, in fact, to be no other body to which the Church could look for the restoration of order. Long centuries of papal dominance had destroyed all power of initiative, all independence in the episcopate. Where not, as in Italy, the creature of the Pope, or, as in Germany, independent secular lords, the bishops had become mere officials of the King, intent foremost on their master's interests. Above all, the Papacy itself, by its division, was driven to seek assistance from a movement it would have been otherwise the first to crush.

The student should realise the revolutionary character of the movement of which Pisa and Constance were the outcome. The medieval Church had been built up on the doctrine of the primacy of Rome. The "primus inter pares" had become in time an absolute vicar of God, "the plenitude of whose power is limited by nothing but divine and natural law." For centuries Canonists had taught that a General Council could not exist without the Pope or in opposition to him, for the decrees of such a Council "receive their ecumenical validity solely from his con-

firmation." From his decisions there was no appeal, for the Pope "holds his power *for* the Church, not *from* her; he is not her representative and delegate, but her divinely appointed head."[1]

Such dogmas were shaken to the base by the new theories which exalted a General Council into the supreme head, reduced the Papacy to a limited executive, and created and deposed Popes by the votes of a Church democracy. "Pisa," writes Gregorovius (vi. 606) "was the first real step towards the deliverance of the world from the papal hierarchy; it was already the Reformation." This, though an exaggeration, yet contains elements of truth. For the essential fact about the Council of Pisa is that it did not attempt to base its proceedings on mere legality. The Council recognised from the first the slough into which legal quibbles would lead it. Though they would not have owned it to themselves, and even sought to cover it by obtaining the opinions of Universities, the cardinals appealed really for the validity of their deeds to popular support. From this to the doctrine of the Reformers, that Church organisation, as distinct from doctrine,[2]

[1] Pastor, i. 179–81. These views are not modern.

[2] Lest I should be misunderstood, let me state that there is a "doctrine" of Church organisation which does not "rest on popular assent," as well as a doctrine which does.

must rest on popular assent and convenience, was not a far cry.

On all hands, even among the most orthodox, we may discern the antipapal tendencies of the age. Europe was flooded with controversial literature in favour of the new idea. The writers may be roughly divided into the two schools, the more advanced German school and the more moderate Gallican. The former looked to the revival of the Empire, 'whose power is held direct from God';[1] the latter, to the rights of national churches and the influence of the international doctorate.

As representative of the German school, we may take a treatise by Dietrich of Niem. Whatever his other qualifications, his knowledge of the ways of the Roman Curia cannot be denied. In his *De Modis Uniendi ac Reformandi Ecclesiam*, Niem[2] goes almost as far as a latter-day Protestant, not without indebtedness to Marsiglio's *Defensor Pacis*.[3] The papal primacy was won by

[1] Cf. Niem, *De Schis.*, 216–9, 221–6; *Nem. Un.*, 356; *De Modis Uniendi*, p. 92, 98–104, 116, 120; *De Necessitate Ref.*, p. 297–301. Cf. the Sermons of Nicholas Dinkelsbühl and Laschar, Bp. of Posen, at Constance (Jan. 1415) in Lab., xvi. 1291–1300; Hardt, ii. 182–7; also Vrie in Hardt, i. (1) 76–81.

[2] For this treatise and its authorship, see Appendix B.

[3] Vol. i. p. 80. See espec. Niem, *Schis.*, 224 n. 2, by Erler.

fraud and usurpation. An infallible Pope is an absurdity.

> What is a Pope? A man! the son of man! clay of clay, a sinner liable to sin. Two days before the son of a poor peasant, he is created Pope. Is he now without need of penitence, confession, contrition? Has he now become an angel, unable to sin? . . . Pope as Pope is man, and as Pope can sin, and as man can err (Hardt, i. (5) p. 77).

The Catholic Church, which must not be confused with the Roman Church, alone can never err. This consists of all who believe in Christ, who is its only Head. In government it is represented by a General Council, 'which should meet every five or six years.' Such a Council the Pope, 'who is a member only, not the head,' but who has overthrown the ancient constitution of the Church, and destroyed the authority of the bishops, 'is bound in all things to obey.' Otherwise, Pope or prelate should be removed if the needs of the State demand. The limitation of the papal power and the restoration of the ancient rights of the Church must be the object of every Reformer; otherwise, 'I fear that any reformation, though reduced to writing, oaths, and covenants, will not be kept by Pope, cardinals, and the other officers of the Curia,' whose avarice Niem scathingly exposes.

Niem did not stand alone. The power, said

Langenstein,[1] to elect a Pope rested originally with the episcopate, and reverts to it if the cardinals abuse their rights. The Council, as representative of the Church, is necessarily superior in authority to the Pope, for of the Church alone did Christ say that the gates of hell should not prevail against her. To Ludolf Meistermann of Sagan, the opponent of Hus, the pre-eminence of a Council above the Pope seemed beyond dispute.[2] Another German theologian, Conrad of Gelnhausen, maintained that the Pope derives his authority from the will of the faithful, and must therefore be subordinate to the prelates of the Church gathered in Council. Matthew of Cracow laid down the same doctrine in language even more daring in its freedom.[3] An anonymous writer at Constance, while granting the executive

[1] Henry Langenstein, often called Henry of Hesse, in his *Concilium Pacis de Unione*, written at Paris, 1381. [Printed in *Op. Gerson*, ii. 809–40; Hardt, ii. (1) 1–59.] The cardinal pages *re* the Council are (Hardt) 20–32. On pp. 50–3 Langenstein gives a list of needed reforms, which gains effectiveness from its restraint.

[2] Sagan (*infra*, p. 89), pp. 99–100, 103.

[3] Pastor, i. 184. Cracow's *De Squaloribus Romanæ Curiæ* is in Brown, *Fasciculus*, ii. 584–607. The passages on the subject are easily found, for they are marked by Brown with a ☜. In its present form the work is interpolated. Cracow (not Krakow in Pomerania. See Loserth, 57 n.) was a lecturer at Prague, Bp. of Worms 1405, died 1410. Hus would therefore hear him.

authority of the Pope, laid down that 'when once the Church has gathered together, then the duties of its servant (*i.e.* the Pope) ceases, just as a magistracy loses its power when the Prince is present.'[1]

This doctrine, so revolutionary of the creed or usage of centuries, found its defenders even in Italy. The ideas, which in their extremest form first obtained shape in the work of Marsiglio of Padua, received a measure of support from another Paduan, the celebrated Zabarella, whose renown as a lawyer was such that he was commonly called "the king of the canon law." The Pope, said Zabarella, is but the executive officer of the Church, *i.e.* of the General Council, to whose authority he is therefore necessarily subject.[2] Though the canonists of Bologna could not assent to these principles, so subversive of the whole system their labours had reared, they were yet prepared to own that Schism of long duration passes into heresy, that a Pope who nourishes Schism becomes a heretic, from whom the cardinals must withdraw allegiance and seek such relief as they could.[3] To the same effect were

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 292, from a most interesting paper, *ibid.* 288–95, dated 1417.

[2] In his *De Schismate Pontif.* (1406). Printed in S. Schardius' *De Jurisdictione Imperiali* (Basel, 1566), pp. 688–711.

[3] Creighton, i. 239 n.

the conclusions of D'Ailli, who fell back, as a last resort, upon the laws of necessity (*infra*, p. 210).

A greater, because more organised if less revolutionary, part in the Conciliar movement was taken by the University of Paris. With the fall of Wyclif the European influence of Oxford perished. She rapidly drifted from her old cosmopolitanism into splendid isolation. Paris, on the other hand, found in the Schism her opportunity for restoring the loss she had suffered during the fourteenth century from wars and internal feuds. She contrived to cling to the old internationalism, while at the same time satisfying French pride by aspiring to the control of the Papacy itself. Her theologians had long claimed to be the superiors in matters of theology of the elect of Avignon or Rome. They had rebuked John XXII. for heterodoxy;[1] they drove the reluctant Clement VII. into assent to the new doctrine of the Immaculate Conception condemned by St. Bernard.[2] They now identified themselves with a movement for ending the disorders of Christendom by substituting for the absolute government of Pope and cardinals a limited monarchy under the guidance of an international Council.[3]

[1] See Vol. i. p. 102 n.

[2] Creighton, i. 110–1; Lea, *op. cit.* iii. 599–600.

[3] The views of the extremer members of the University can

The leaders of the French school were D'Ailli and Gerson. With D'Ailli it will be more convenient to deal when we write of Constance. His pupil John Charlier, of Gerson, a village of Champagne (born Dec. 14, 1363), was a far grander spirit. The child of poor but pious parents, the eldest of twelve, Gerson won his way before he was thirty to the highest place in the scholarship of Europe, and in 1396 succeeded D'Ailli as Chancellor of Paris. He was thus called to lead the University in the difficult negotiations and struggles of diplomacy which preceded Pisa. His ideal was the establishment of national churches, the government of which should be by national synods; the requisite unity of life and doctrine to be preserved by regular international councils, under the presidency of the Pope, whom he regarded as the permanent executive. To his works on the supreme authority of Councils both Pisa and Constance turned for the justification of their actions.[1] When at a critical moment the Pope fled to Schaffhausen, all Constance poured into its cathedral

be best studied in a paper they presented at Constance, which was not received by the Council. See Lab., xvi. 812–4; Hardt, ii. 275–80.

[1] See his *De Potestate Ecclesiastica* (Feb. 6, 1417) in Hardt, vi. 78–135, with convenient summary of argument, pp. 135–7.

that they might reassure their fears by hearing a sermon from Gerson on this cardinal theme.[1] With modern Ultramontanism, as his writings show, Gerson would have had no sympathy; while his severe logic disdained 'the popular superstitions which infect the Christian religion' —the running after miracles, saints, and the like. He dreaded all movements that made their appeal to the emotions, or which leaped the bounds of an ordered faith. At Constance he opposed, though in vain, the canonisation of Bridget, while he sought to check the excesses of the Flagellants and bring them within the rule of the Church.[2] The number of feasts, he urged, should be reduced. Their effect was to deprive the labourer of wages. Nevertheless he advocated the favourite idea of Paris, the immediate institution of a new Feast of the Immaculate Conception.[3]

The genuine anxiety of Gerson for a reform of the Church in head and members might have

[1] March 23, 1415. In Hardt, ii. 265–74; *Op. Gerson*, ii. 201–6. See especially the twelve conclusions, and of these No. 9.

[2] See his common-sense *De Probatione Spirituum* (Hardt, iii. (3) 28–38; *Opera*, i. 37–43, abstract in Lenfant, *C.C.*, 695–700); and for the Flagellants (July 18, 1417), Lab., xvi. 1160–4; Hardt, iii. 94–105.

[3] Sept. 8, 1416. Hardt, iv. 39.

led Hus to expect sympathy and support. In reality the two men were severed by impassable gulfs. Gerson was a Nominalist, the head of that school. By a singular revolution of thought the Nominalists had persuaded themselves that no Realist could possibly hold orthodox conceptions concerning Transubstantiation. To this extent they were correct: the Nominalist could more easily juggle away the substances, was less prone to a doctrine of Remanence, than a thorough-paced Realist. Of Hus the Realist, therefore, even apart from his theological views, Gerson had the deepest suspicion, which would not be lessened by what he heard of the violent results of his teaching. For like all men whose lives have been spent in academic circles, Gerson shrunk back from that appeal to the people which Hus paraded. The very earnestness of Gerson to secure lasting reforms only made him the more anxious to disassociate himself from one whose revolutionary methods seemed to him to make reform impossible.

That in the condemnation of Hus at Constance Gerson did not take so leading a part as D'Ailli was due, in fact, to the cardinal's official position. For D'Ailli was the papal legate for the provinces of Mainz, Cologne, Salzburg, Trier, and Prague.[1] Yet after the burning of Hus, or rather after the

[1] Appointed, March 18, 1413, by John XXIII. (Finke, *F. Q.*, 310).

contrast between the Council's treatment of the Reformer and its lax attitude with respect to John Petit had stung Gerson with the sense of injustice, some doubts as to the trial seem to have vexed his soul. On October 12, 1415, he complained publicly in the French "nation," 'that in a matter of heresy he would sooner be judged by Jews and pagans than by the inquisitors appointed by the Council.' 'If Hus,' he added, 'had been allowed an advocate he would never have been condemned.'[1] But when he said this he was realising from personal experience what it meant to come under the suspicions of the Inquisition.

The years that followed Constance were embittered for Gerson by the hatred aroused against him by his somewhat violent action in the Council in the affair of John Petit (*infra*, p. 238). Refused return to France by the all-powerful Burgundians, he was forced to wander for his life in the mountains of Bavaria. In an obscure monastery of the Tirol[2] this stormy champion of

[1] *Op. Gers.*, v. 444. As regards the first charge (for these form part of 25 heresies and errors extracted from Gerson's writings and presented to the Council by the Bishop of Arras), Gerson owned (p. 450), 'ponitur minis crude generaliter.' The charges were made by the Burgundians as an answer to his attack over Petit.

[2] Rattenberg, a decayed town on the line from Kufstein to Innsbruck. For this exile, Hardt, iv. 1584, i. (4) 45.

a stormy age found at last a refuge of peace. There he occupied himself in composing his *Consolations of Theology* and his *Testament of a Pilgrim*—"Gershom," Peregrinus, as he called himself in jest; for, said he, I have been a stranger in a strange land. A tradition, French in origin, and maintained chiefly by French patriotism, maintains that in this retreat he wrote also that sweetest and humblest of books—*The Imitation of Christ.*[1] In this, tradition undoubtedly errs; nevertheless, its insight is correct. Though the words are the words of Thomas of Kempen, the book springs from that mystical theology of love which had formed the constant theme of Gerson's lectures, and which had won for him the proud title of 'Doctor Christianissimus.' By the same royal road of the cross as Thomas, Gerson also had found the *regnum et diadema tutum.*

From Rattenberg, after a visit to Vienna, where he was received with great honour, Gerson retired in 1419 to the Celestine monastery of St. Paul at Lyons, of which his brother was

[1] The examination of this legend and its acres of literature is no part of my plan. All that can be said for Gerson (or Gersen) is brought together by Dupin, *Op. Gerson*, i. pp. lix–lxxxiv. The claim is still maintained by the French, cf. Masson, *op. cit.* 357–74.

prior. There the Chancellor of Paris spent the eventide of life in the instruction of children. He would sit, we are told, long hours in silence, praying for the return of peace to his unhappy country, bewailing the downfall of his University. When he felt that the end was come, he gathered his children around him for the last time, that they might pray with him: 'O God, our Creator, have mercy on Thy poor servant, John Gerson.' So, with a heart like that of a little child, the great leader in a fierce conflict passed "to where beyond these voices there is peace" (July 12, 1429). The last words he wrote were expressive of his life:

Noster solus amor Jesus.

II

The General Councils of the rival Popes—'*conciliabula*,' as they were called in scorn—need not detain us. Gregory's Council is rightly described by Neander as "an insignificant farce." It was some time before the old man could find a secure place in which to hold it. Finally it met (June 1409) in Cividale del Friuli. There a handful of prelates anathematised all and sundry.[1] Benedict's Council was of more importance. One hundred and twenty bishops and

[1] Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 294–7; Hefele, vi. 896–8.

abbots, chiefly Spanish, assembled at Perpignan (Nov. 15, 1408). They begged him to adopt, without delay, the method of "cession." Benedict replied that to give up the Papacy would be a mortal sin: if the whole world advised him to give way, and he thought he ought not, he would follow his own conscience. If he heard more talk on the matter, 'I will place you,' he said, 'in such a strait place that you will not see the sun for the rest of your days.' The Council, which had already dwindled away to a handful, thereupon broke up (March 1, 1409).[1]

The chief interest of the two Councils lies elsewhere than in their deeds. They showed how completely "the bold theory of an appeal from the Vicar of Christ on earth to Christ Himself, residing in the whole body of the Church," had obtained a hold, that the two rivals should thus have yielded to it. The real mind of the Papacy was better expressed in a letter of Boniface IX.: 'Some impious men, trusting in the arm of flesh against the power of the Lord, cry out for a Council; O damned and damnable

[1] Hardt, iv. 1249–50; fuller account, Lab., xv. 1115–22, *Sup. Lab.*, iii. 813–34. Creighton, i. 224, follows the account of Boniface Ferrer, who represents Benedict as "agreeing to act upon it." Benedict's obstinacy, and a general desire to blacken his character, must be weighed against Ferrer's partiality.

impiety!' We see the same spirit in the answer of Gregory to those who suggested that he 'should submit the question to the judgment of the Universities of Bologna, Paris, and Siena: 'I am Pope,' he replied, 'and have no need of anyone's counsel. Yes, I am above the law, and you must conform to my decisions.' Only the most stubborn necessity could have driven the Papacy to admit the dangerous claims of the Conciliarists.[1]

Meanwhile Europe, under the pressure of the University of Paris, prepared to obey the summons of the rebel cardinals at Pisa. Even the English, in spite of the efforts of Gregory to win over the King by electing his friend Philip Repyngdon as cardinal, abandoned Gregory to his fate. Henry's heart, in fact, was 'most blessedly kindled with zeal for the union of the Church.' So a special convocation at St. Paul's, under the lead of Arundel, followed the example of France, and resolved that all papal dues should be collected and retained by the King's officers until there should be only one recognised head of the Church. In this they were but following the order of the cardinals, who, on July 1, had called upon the faithful to withhold all gifts and dues of any kind from the Popes

[1] Creighton, i. 228; Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 265.

until the Schism should be at an end.[1] At a later convocation (Jan. 1409) delegates were chosen, chief of whom was the illustrious Hallum, to represent England.[2] But the rival Popes still found recognition: Gregory in Naples, Hungary, and Rhineland; while Scotland, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark gave a doubtful, Aragon a hearty support to the Spaniard.

The Council of Pisa opened on Ladyday, 1409, in the famous cathedral. 'We are splendidly lodged,' wrote the Bishop of Poictiers, waxing eloquent over the 'white wines and great abundance of victuals, sold at very reasonable prices.' The place of gathering was in a sense significant. Pisa, the free republic, for centuries the stronghold of Ghibelline ideals, had fallen beneath the sword of Florence. 'The said Florentines,' continued the gossiping bishop, 'have transported 2000 of the citizens to Florence. To prevent treason, they have there to show themselves twice a day to the governors, on pain of their heads.'[3] The Ghibelline idea was dead; it remained to be seen what would be the effect on the Papacy of the new conception of a limited monarchy.

[1] 'Letters of Neutrality' in Lab., xv. 1292–4.
[2] Wals., ii. 280; Lab., xv. 1232.
[3] Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 239.

Of the numbers present at the Council no accurate list has been preserved.[1] At one of the later sessions there were present, as we know, 22 cardinals, more than 160 archbishops, bishops, mitred abbots, and heads of orders or their proctors, 123 doctors of theology, and 282 doctors of civil and canon law, chiefly representatives of the Universities,—a significant sign of the new power of learning,—without counting the ambassadors of kings and princes.[2] The countries which still cleaved to the rival Popes were not represented. But Rupert, who was still contesting with Wenzel the throne of the Empire, sent his deputies to present his 'doubts and difficulties' —in other words, his protest against the whole proceedings. Ladislaus of Naples, the only real danger to the Council, was, however, held in check by the skill of Cardinal Cossa, who had won the support of Florence. Under the shelter

[1] For instance, was Gerson at Pisa? Masson, *op. cit.* 263, says "he took part in almost all the deliberations." More accurately, but to the same effect, Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 288; Creighton, i. 241. According to Schwab, 223, 228, 230, 231, he was never there. Cf. *Op. Gerson*, ii. 113, 206. In the list of names for France, chosen Nov. 6, 1408 (in *Lab. Supl.*, iii. 808–11), Gerson's name is not one, nor does his sermon before the English delegates on their way to Pisa, *ibid.* 888–901, contain any indication that he was going.

[2] See the lists in Lab., xv. 1231–47; cf. Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 350–66. Aretin. *Ep.*, iii. 12, speaks of 'a great multitude.'

of her wealth and strength the Council could meet in Pisa in safety. No monument more splendid to the power of medieval democracy could have been erected than the opening words of the safe-conducts which Florence furnished to princes and prelates: 'Nos priores artium et vexillifer justitiæ Populi et Communitatis Florentiæ.'[1]

After the formal opening of the sessions, the absent Popes, who bore even in the Council the nicknames of Errorius and Benefictus, were thrice summoned at the gates of the cathedral. On the advice of Hallum all the cardinals were required to subtract obedience from the usurpers. The way was now clear for the Council to declare the union of the two colleges 'legitimate and necessary.'[2] The next step was not the less revolutionary because the logical result of decisions already reached. On June 5, 1409, the Popes were declared '*ipso facto* rejected of God' as 'notorious schismatics, partisans, and heretics,' who had 'scandalised the Church by their manifest obstinacy.' An official preacher even went so far as to call them 'Annas and Caiaphas, devils from hell, no more popes than his old shoes.'[3] 'The

[1] *Lab. Supl.*, iii. 874. For the safe-conduct they sent to Benedict, Martène, *Coll.*, vii. 921–2.

[2] May 10, Lab., xv. 1212.

[3] Lenfant, i. 273.

Roman See,' it was declared, 'is now vacant.'[1] The advanced party proposed that the Council should elect the new Pope itself. The Council wisely shrank back from so daring an innovation, and accepted the compromise, not without its revolutionary side, of authorising the cardinals to proceed to an election.[2] So on the 15th, after a day spent in devotions, twenty-four cardinals entered the conclave. After eleven days of perhaps less intrigue than usual,[3] they unanimously chose Peter Philargi, Archbishop of Milan. His age—he was over seventy—showed the intention. Philargi would avail to tide over a temporary difficulty. The choice was wise in that he was neither French nor Italian, but, for the first time for seven centuries, a Greek. On Sunday, July 7, the new Pope was crowned on a high scaffold in front of the cathedral, while Gregory and Benedict were burned in effigy. With this ceremony the energies of the Council became exhausted. A month later (Aug. 7) it was formally adjourned, to meet together to discuss proposals of reform when the effect of their

[1] Niem, *Schis.*, 307–10. Lab., xv. 1137, for the sentence of deprivation. Cf. Hefele, vi. 885–7 n.

[2] June 13, Lab., xv. 1140.

[3] See the different versions, Lenfant, i. 286, 303. No details in Labbe or Hardt.

deposition of the contending Popes could be better seen.

The news of Philargi's election had been received in Paris with bonfires and processions. 'The University rejoiced that she had reared one saint for the Church.' In a sermon at Paris, Gerson proclaimed that under the new Greek Pope an even greater schism, that of East and West, would now pass away.[1] In England the papal collectors were again allowed their dues, while sermons and Te Deums at St. Paul's thanked God for the termination of the Schism. Such rejoicing proved premature. The Council at Pisa had scarcely disbanded before men realised that its remedy had only aggravated the disease. The Church had only set up one molten calf the more. The Bride of Christ had now three husbands instead of two; or as Hus expressed it, the Church had now gained for herself 'three beasts fighting for place, pomp, and greed.'[2] The two old Popes were not alone in regarding the Council

[1] Gerson, *Opera*, ii. 141–51.

[2] *Mon.*, i. 260*b*. Cf. Dietrich Vrie (Hardt, i. (1) 21): 'Quomodo ergo tres uxores duxisti?' Forsan concubinæ sunt.' Also the MS. in Finke, *F.Q.*, 281: 'Eam dualitatem infamem, nunc vero trinitatem non benedictam, sed ab omnibus maledictam, videt in ecclesia Dei monstruossime militare.' In Hardt, i. (1) 146–8, Vrie fears lest Constance should lead to four popes, as Pisa to three.

as 'a damned collection of devils,' 'a cursed seditious, diabolical, heretical, adulterous conventicle'—we quote the language of Boniface Ferrer. In every city there were found thoughtful men—for example, Antonin, the saintly Archbishop of Florence—who questioned much the legality of thus deposing two Popes, one of whom must have been the real vicar of Christ. The dilemma was neatly expressed by the envoys of the anti-kaiser, Rupert. Either Gregory was the duly appointed Pope, whose election had been acknowledged by Christendom, in which case the Council was illegal; if, on the other hand, he were not legitimate, neither were the cardinals, whose authority for the most part was derived from the same source as himself. Nor was the union of the two Colleges any added source of strength, for, after all, the cardinals of one party could alone be lawful.[1] Even in the Council itself there had been signs not a few—unseemly haste, harsh treatment of the opposition, and the excessive protests which always spring from consciousness of weakness—that delegates were doubtful of their own proceedings, suspicious of the resolution of their colleagues. Even its well-wishers were bound to own that Pisa had failed. The cause

[1] See the interesting paper (April 15), with the replies of the Council, in Lab., xv. 1179–87.

was not far to seek; the Council had sought to override rather than conciliate. The result was not unity, but a 'threefold division and still greater discord.' 'Pisa,' wrote Clémanges, 'cried to the people, "Peace, peace, when there was no peace."'[1] Clémanges himself is no fair judge, but in this, at anyrate, he represented public opinion.

The career of the new Pope is one of the romances which the Papacy alone can furnish. Like the great English Pope, Hadrian IV., he had once been a beggar. The place of his birth is uncertain, but according to the inscription over his tomb he was born at Candia, in Crete, then in the power of the Venetians. As he told his cardinals, 'he had never known father or mother'; he had been picked up by Franciscans, and trained by them at Paris and Oxford. After a brilliant academic course he had entered the service of Gian Galeazzo Visconti of Milan,—he who built her cathedral and the famous Certosa at Pavia,—and had been rewarded by that most successful of Italian tyrants with the Archbishopric of Milan.[2]

[1] Hardt, i. (2) 60.

[2] Niem, *Sch.*, 319; Ciac., ii. 773–4. His seal is: Exaltavit me Deus in virtute brachii sui (*ibid.* ii. 776). A life in modern Greek: *Alexander V., Byzantium and the Synod of Basel* (Athens, 1881), has recently been published. I have not seen it.

As a Pope, though free from vice, except love of wine and good cheer, Alexander v. was not a success. The new Pope, wrote Niem, 'although a great theologian, was completely inexperienced in the duties demanded by his high office. So whatever the cardinals asked from him, he granted without gainsaying, nor did he deny them aught.'[1] We need not be surprised at the result. 'As bishop,' he laughed, 'he had been rich; as Pope, he was now a beggar.' Everything drifted into confusion, for business was conducted without method.

Meanwhile a new quarrel had burst out, or rather been revived, which added not a little to the existing confusion. The nepotism of Alexander—relatives he had none—took the form of excessive grants to the mendicants, who, on his election, 'in their joy had run about the streets and squares in crowds like madmen.'[2] In this matter alone Alexander ventured to oppose his cardinals. Blind alike to the signs of the times and to the degeneration of the friars, Alexander swept away the few remaining restraints against their encroachment on the rights and duties of parish priests. The strife between seculars and regulars was at once stirred into flame. The

[1] Hardt, i. (6) 262, in the *De Diff. Ref.*, see Appendix B.
[2] Niem, *Schis.*, 326.

University of Paris professed to believe that the bull was not genuine; their chancellor preached against it. Gerson was a prophet of a new age in his assertion that 'the status of curates was far higher than that of religious.' The next century would witness the triumph of the seculars.[1]

III

The cardinals realised clearly that if their action at Pisa was to be established, they must crush Gregory, or rather Gregory's protector Ladislaus. The young Louis of Anjou was summoned to Pisa to claim the throne of Naples. An allied army under the command of this duke and the Neapolitan Cardinal Baldassare Cossa set out for Rome. The surrender of the capital (Jan. 1410) placed Alexander in a sure position. His sudden death at Bologna (May 3), in the tenth month of his pontificate,—poisoned by Cossa, men said,—was followed by the election of Cossa himself, as John XXIII. (May 17, 1410).

[1] Vol. i. p. 57 ff. *Opera Gerson*, ii. 431–46, analysed Lenfant, *C.P.*, i. 316–20. For Alexander and the monks, see Lenfant, i. 310–6. Alexander's bull is of interest because of the unsparing way in which he condemns his predecessors: 'The statute of John XXII., *Vas Electionis*, is null and void, because he was a heretic when he made it.' Alexander's bull was revoked by John XXIII. (June 27, 1410; Lenfant, *C.P.*, ii. 8, 9).

No election more unfortunate could have been made, nor one better calculated by its scandal to add to the legacy of difficulty left behind by Pisa. 'The very tapsters,' it was said, would not have chosen such a Pope. Probably the cardinals could not help themselves. They were overmastered, if not by Cossa, by the political circumstances whose springs of action Cossa controlled, while Louis of Anjou urged on the election of his brother-in-arms.[1] But the blame of the election must not be thrown on either Louis or Cossa. The cardinals cannot escape the responsibility. According to Niem, whose hatred of John makes him in this a trustworthy guide, the cardinals had only been persuaded from electing Cossa at Pisa by the appeals of Cossa himself that they would elect Philargi.[2]

The character of Cossa is one of the puzzles of history. The memoirs we possess are too coloured by hatred and special pleading to be safely followed. After his overthrow,—rather in consequence of it,—his enemies united in painting him as a moral monster, who had not only poisoned Alexander but had been guilty of every conceivable crime. A long catalogue of his iniquities

[1] Niem, *Schis.*, 328.

[2] See the important passage, *Vita J. XXIII.*, Hardt, ii. 355. The twist given to it is a fair sample of Niem's hatred of John.

was drawn up by the Council of Constance. Many of these, no doubt, may justly be laid at his door; but others are the *væ victis* with which his opponents, in an age of unscrupulous pamphleteering, felt it necessary to justify the strong measures they had taken against him. Whether true or false, John does not stand alone in his condemnation. 'What judgment,' added an ancient scribe, after copying out the charges,

'ought we to pass on the cardinals who elected John, after having sworn to choose the best among them, unless indeed the best among them was one who now stood convicted of being a ravisher, incendiary, traitor, homicide, an incestuous fornicator, guilty of crimes more flagrant still.'[1]

This much must be allowed, that John was an utterly worldly if not vicious man. As Aretino strikingly puts it: 'In spiritual things John was altogether nothing, and useless.'[2] The testimony of Poggio, in spite of his desire 'not to speak ill of the dead,' is the same: 'John knew neither honour nor religion.' The new Pope was rather a soldier of fortune than a Churchman; in fact, at the time of his election he was only in deacon's orders. In his youth, so the story ran, he had been a corsair. He had then turned cleric, and

[1] Hardt, iv. 235. See also *infra*, p. 229. I have examined at length the evidence for the character of John in Appendix C.

[2] *Comment.*, 927.

won his way to the heart of Boniface by his business skill in the sale of indulgences and preferments. Created legate, he then wrested Bologna from the grip of the Visconti. His nine years rule of that city was a reign of tyranny and lust, so his enemies said, 'more cruel than Nero.' Nevertheless, under it 'the city flourished exceedingly,' though he killed so many people 'that if they were all alive they would scarcely be able to dwell with convenience in any small town.' [1]

Of John's cleverness in the ruder forms of intrigue there can be no doubt. By bribery and diplomatic skill, after failing with his condottieri, the new Pope speedily drew Ladislaus into his net. In return for John's throwing overboard Louis of Anjou,—not before Louis had shown his incompetence,—and 100,000 florins of gold, Ladislaus promised to acknowledge John as Pope [2] 'by the grace of the Holy Spirit,' support him with a thousand lances, and drive Gregory from his dominions. The aged Gregory, with his three cardinals, was forced to escape in haste by sea to the only refuge he could find, at the court of the high-minded Charles Malatesta of Rimini. Fortune further aided John by the termination of the struggle of the three claimants of the Empire. In

[1] Niem, *Vita*, 339, 340–1, 348–9.

[2] *Ibid.* 367. Niem owns it is hearsay only.

July 1411 Sigismund was unanimously elected King of the Romans, one of the conditions of his election being that he should recognise John as the true Pope. But Sigismund was no sooner elected than he began his schemes for John's overthrow.

The Council of Pisa, before it adjourned, had decreed that another Council, to be regarded as the continuation of itself, should be held 'for the reform of the Church in its head and members,' 'in the month of April 1412, in a suitable place to be declared a year beforehand.' Accordingly, after some delay,[1] there gathered at St. Peter's a Council, or rather a shadow of one—'a few monks and simoniacs of Rome,' sneered Hus' friend Jesenic, 'met in a corner.'[2] At its first session,[3] so ran the familiar story, as the Council was singing *Veni Creator Spiritus*, an owl, with a

[1] For the first postponement, see Finke, *Con. Const.*, i. 127–31.

[2] *Documenta J. Hus*, 470.

For the Roman Council of 1412–3 we are really singularly destitute of knowledge. Labbe (xv. 1379–82) gives only the decree against Wyclif. The best account is in Finke, *Acta Concilii Constanciensis*, i. pp. 108–168. [1896, first volume alone published as yet (1902).] See also Palacky, *Doc.*, 467–71. The Paris University prepared for it a scheme of reform under fifty-one heads, a very interesting document, showing the hand of Gerson throughout. See Finke, *C.C.*, 131–48. This advocates the increased power of national synods, bishops, etc.—the Gallican idea, in fact.

[3] Jan. 1413. Creighton, following Mansi, dates Feb. 10, 1413. But see note 2 on the next page.

startling hoot, swept into the Church and perched on a beam opposite the Pope. 'The Holy Ghost is present in the shape of an owl,' tittered the cardinals. As the owl, 'herald always of a second funeral,' continued to stare at him, John, in confusion, broke up the assembly. The next day the owl was again present, until driven out at last with sticks. The incident, though not strictly true,[1] was generally believed, and showed, at anyrate, the repute in which the Pope and his Council were held. Its one achievement was its solemn condemnation of 'the Dialogue Trialogue and many other works inscribed with the name of the said John Wyclif' (Feb. 2, 1413). A week later the books were publicly burnt before the doors of St. Peter's.[2] After delivering the

[1] The story was first given by Clémanges, as an illustration of his general argument for the discredit of Councils, in a letter written some years after. See Hardt, i. (2) 67–8. He really transferred to the Council, with the usual additions in telling, an incident that had occurred the previous Whitsuntide. See Niem, *Vita J. XXIII.*, in Hardt, ii. 375. The owl duly appears in Picart's portrait of John. See Lenfant, *C.P.*, ii. 4.

[2] Feb. 10, 1413. See *Documenta*, 467–9, for the bull and dates, with the interesting gloss of Jesenic, *ibid.* 470–1, who points out that the official document is wrongly dated Jan. 6, the Feast of Epiphany. No session ever met on such a feast-day; nevertheless the date is of value, as evidence that the Council met early in January. In Lab., xv. 1379–82, it is dated Feb. 2. Cf. Mansi, xxvii. 349 n., 358 n. Mansi inclines to but one session, 'since Antonius Petri notes no other.'

Church from 'this leaven of the Pharisees,' the Council adjourned.

The Council was a farce. John never intended that it should be otherwise. Nor had he any designs of holding another. But the perfidy of Ladislaus and the ambition of Sigismund decreed otherwise. Suddenly breaking his treaty with the Pope,—he had, in fact, but signed the treaty that he might gain time,—Ladislaus captured Rome. 'I saw on that day,' says Niem, with evident delight, John and his cardinals, 'who, formerly living at peace in the city, had become so delicate that scarcely would they ride on horseback for their health, now run on foot' for nine miles for their lives.[1] While Ladislaus was busy over the pillage of their goods, John succeeded in escaping to Florence. He realised bitterly that he had been overreached. What was worse, he was now driven to consent to the demands of Sigismund, and make good his promise of a Council. 'All depends,' said the Pope to Aretino,

on the place appointed for the Council. I will not trust myself within the dominions of the Emperor. My ambassadors, for the sake of appearances, shall have liberal instructions and the fullest powers—to display in public. In private I shall limit them to certain cities (*Comment.*, 928).

But Sigismund was determined that the Council

[1] *Vita J. XXIII.*, Hardt, ii. 381.

should not gather within the sphere of influence of John. When the negotiations took place, the Pope's envoys, one of whom was Zabarella, agreed to Constance, whether by John's negligence, their betrayal of trust, or because, as Aretino puts it, 'all is governed from above.'[1] Sigismund lost no time in following up his advantage. He issued a circular, as the official 'Defender and Advocate of the Church,' summoning all princes and prelates, not forgetting Gregory and Benedict, to Constance, and guaranteeing protection.[2] Hopelessly caught in a net of his own weaving, John was forced, after a vain conference with Sigismund at Lodi, to announce to the world (Dec. 9, 1413)[3] that, in accordance with an understanding with the King of the Romans, the Council would meet in Constance on November 1, 1414. A presentiment

[1] For their Commission, given Aug. 25, 1413, at Florence, at 'St. Anthony without the walls,' see Palacky, *Documenta*, 513 (not in Raynald or Hardt).

[2] Dated Oct. 30 at Vegui, near Como. See Palacky, *Doc.*, 515–8; Lab., xvi. 793; Hardt, vi. 5.

[3] Lab. xvi. 17–9; Hardt, vi. 9. The meeting with Sigismund took place in the previous November. For this, see Finke, *C.C.*, i. 174–9. Sigismund had made up his mind to call a Council eighteen months before; see his letter to Henry v. of England, March 12, 1412, *ibid.* 89–92. For Sigismund's subsequent negotiations with Gregory XII. in the summer of 1414, see *ibid.* 196–203; with Charles VI. of France, the Paris University, and Henry v. of England in the spring and summer of 1414, see *ibid.* 215–33, with documents, 358–91.

of the issue already dawned upon the Pope. 'I am aware,' he said, 'that the Council is not in my favour, but how can I contend against my fate?'[1] Fate indeed was fighting against him. Nine months after John had committed himself to the measure which would end in his ruin, his enemy Ladislaus died at Naples, worn out with his debaucheries.[2] For John the relief came too late. 'Fat fowls,' sneered Niem, 'because they will not walk to market of their own accord, have to be carried. We are content you have come.'[3]

[1] Pastor, 195 n.

[2] For his character, career, and vast tomb,—'divus Ladislas,'—the admiration of tourists, see Creighton, espec. i. 292–3.

[3] Niem, *Invectiva*, 319.

CHAPTER III

THE FORERUNNERS OF HUS

Liber generacionis maledicciones omnium hereticorum filiorum: Diaboli filius Wykleph, Wykleph genuit Stanislaum, Stanislaus genuit Petrum de Znoyma, et Petrus de Znoyma, genuit Palecz, et Palecz genuit Hus.—Hus: *Monumenta*, i. 255*b*.

Credo in Wykleph ducem inferni patronum Boemie, et in Hus filium ejus unicum nequam nostrum, qui conceptus est ex spiritu Luciperi, natus matre ejus et factus incarnatus equalis Wykleph secundum malam voluntatem et major secundum ejus persecucionem, regnans tempore desolacionis studii Pragensis, tempore quo Boemia a fide apostotavit. Qui propter nos hereticos descendit ad inferna et non resurget a mortuis, nec habebit vitam eternam. Amen.

Missa Wiklefistarum
(Loserth: *Wiclif and Hus*, p. 351).

GENERAL BIBLIOGRAPHY OF HUS AND HIS TIMES.

I. The Forerunners.

The main authority for this and other periods is Palacky, *Geschichte von Böhmen* (Prague, 1845), vol. iii. pt. i. (from 1378–1419). Palacky, writing under the assumed name of Jordan, brought out also *Die Verläufer des Hussitenthums* (Leipzig, 1845), dealing with Conrad, Milicz, etc. This work, though frequently quoted by Neander, Loserth, and others, is unfortunately at present (1902) not in the British Museum. I have therefore not seen it. Much of its matter is, however, in the *Geschichte*, as also in Loserth, *Wiclif and Hus* (London, trans. Evans., 1884), which contains (pp. 3–63 and 301–7) a valuable study of "the forerunners." Neander, ix. 250–338, is very full on these, but undoubtedly exaggerates their Reformation tendencies. See also Höfler, *Geschichtsschreiber der Husitischen Bewegung in Böhmen*, ii. 17–48. [In the "Fontes Rerum Austriacarum," Vienna, 1865, 3 vols.] This work, ultra-Roman,—Czech never translated, and therefore often useless,—is of great value, though severely criticised by Palacky, *Geschichte des Hussitenthums* (1869).

For Milicz there is a most interesting anonymous life, as well as one by Janow, printed in Balbinus, *Miscellanea Historica Bohemiæ*, dec. i. lib. iv. pt. ii. pp. 43–64 [cited as "Balb."]. For Ernest we possess the short life by William, Dean of Wyschehrad (in Höfler, *op. cit.* ii. 1–11], expanded by the Jesuit Balbin, in 1664, into his large *Vita Ernesti*. With the writings of Milicz and Mathias of Janow I have dealt in detail in Appendix H, p. 355 ; cf. App. J, p. 357.

II. The Age of Hus.

Pelzel, *Lebensgeschichte des Königs Wenceslaus* (Prague, 1788, 2 vols.), contains a large collection of documents of value for the period before Hus. Other sources are as follows:— Ludolph of Sagan, *Tractatus de longevo Schismate* [ed. Loserth, in the *Archiv. für Oesterreichische Gesch.*, vol. lx. (Vienna, 1880), pp. 345–561, with life and introduction. Also reprinted, with pagination only altered, in *Beiträge zur Geschichte der Husitischen Bewegung*, vol. iii. (Vienna, 1880). I have used this last: = "Sagan"]. Another contemporary source will be found in the writings of Stephen, Prior of Dola (= "Dolein"). They are printed in Pez, *Thesaurus*, vol. iv. pt. ii. They are as follows: — (1) *In Medullam Tritici* (pp. 151–359), a treatise on the Sacraments, chiefly against Wyclif, and of value rather as showing that the influence of Wyclif on Hus was thus clearly discerned; (2) *Antihussus* (pp. 362–430), dedicated to Stanislaus of Znaim; (3) *Dialogus Volatilis inter aucam et passerem, seu Mag. Hus et Stephanum* (pp. 434–502), dedicated to John, Bishop of Leitomischl; (4) *Epistle to the Hussites* (pp. 505–706), written in 1417, after Hus' death. A third source, Æneas Sylvius (Pope Pius II.), *Historia Bohemica* [ed. Helmstadt, 1649; many other editions], is very slight on Hus (*cc.* 35 and 36 only), though his influence, by being copied, etc., is very great. Cochlæus and other later writers should be disregarded when unsupported. Several small chronicles (*Trebonienſe*, *Univ. Prag.*, *Prokop.*, etc.) and documents, satirical songs, etc., will be found in Höfler, *Geschichtsschreiber*. The essential matters of these are generally given also by Palacky, *Documenta*. The monograph of Höfler, *Mag. J. Hus und der Abzug der deutschen Prof. und Stud. aus Prag*, 1409 (Prague, 1864), is of value not only for the University matter on which it is the standard work, but for the Prague troubles in general.

III. John Hus and his Writings.

The main sources are two. First and foremost, the invaluable *Documenta Mag. Joannis Hus, vitam, doctrinam, causam in Constantiensi Concilio actam, Illustrantia*, ed. Fr. Palacky: Regni Bohemiae Historiographus (Prague, 1869) (cited as *Doc.*); and for his writings: *Historia et Monumenta J. Hus et Hieronymi Prayensis* (Nuremberg, 1858, and with different pagination and some additional matter, 1715). On this work, see below. The Czech works of Hus were first published by Erben (Prague, 1865–8). Of these I know nothing, except the copious extracts translated into Latin by Palacky (see *Doc.*, 713–29). The *Postil* of Hus, containing his Czech sermons, was brought to Herrnhut by its first founders [see De Schweinitz, *Unitas Fratrum*, p. 34 n.], and has been translated by J. Nowotny into German in a series of small tracts, *Sermons of J. Hus on the Gospel for the Advent* (Görlitz, 1854), and *Sermons for Gospels and Feast Days* (Görlitz, 1855), in three parts. See also *Documenta*. They are by no means equal in interest to the sermons of Wyclif [ed. Arnold, *Select Eng. Works*]. The relation of Wyclif and Hus has been settled by the monograph of Loserth, *Wiclif and Hus*. See also the various introductions to the Wyclif Society's edition of the *Works of Wyclif*.

The purely expository works of Hus contain little to detain the historical student. The chief are: *Historia Gestorum Christi ex quattuor Evangelistis*, a harmony without comment; *Passio Domini*, a verse-by-verse harmony and commentary, with glosses that read like fragments of sermons; and three commentaries, *Seven General Epistles*, *The Psalms*, and *Seven Chapters of the Corinthians*, all in the *Monumenta*, vol. ii. For certain sermons commonly ascribed to Hus, see Appendix J, p. 357, where I have shown cause for hesitation.

IV. Modern Lives of Hus.

These are very numerous, but of the majority I must plead ignorance. The best (English) I have seen is A. H. Wratislaw, *John Hus* (1882), with good historical setting and thorough study of the originals, but without references. Equally good, with wider reference, is E. Denis, *Huss et la Guerre des Hussites* (Paris, 1878). E. H. Gillett, *The Life and Times of Hus* (Boston, 1863, 2 vols.), is a full study of the older authorities before Palacky's *Documenta*, but too little critical; he is largely indebted to Becker, *J. Huss und J. von Prag.*, (1858), a popular work without references. Winkelmann, *Gerson, Wicleffus, et Hus inter se comparati* (1857), fails from insufficient knowledge of Wyclif. Moravian works on Hus, and his connection with their Church, as might be expected, are numerous. It may suffice to refer to De Schweinitz, *The History of the Church known as the Unitas Fratrum* (Bethlehem, Pa., 1885), with excellent bibliography. One of the earliest accounts of Hus, Neander, vol. x. (Bohn; trans. Torrey), is still one of the best, especially in analysis of his works. Bonnechose, *Letters of J. H.* (trans. Mackenzie, Edinburgh, 1846), is not of much value. I hope to publish shortly a complete translation of the *Letters of Hus*.

For other works on special points, see the notes. For the environment of Hus, we may mention Wratislaw, *Native Literature of Bohemia in the 14th Cent.* (1878), showing the rise of the Czech spirit in literature; Count Lützow's *Bohemian Literature* (1899), also his *Bohemia* (1896), a good popular history without references, and, lastly, his *Prague* (1902) [Dent's Med. Cities series]; J. Baker, *Pictures from Bohemia* (1894), is an interesting introduction to Hus' native country.

V. Early Printed Editions of Hus.

Unlike the case of Wyclif, the works of Hus, genuine or supposed, were printed at an early date. The result was twofold: the obliteration of Hus' relation to Wyclif, and the assigning to Hus of many treatises by others. On this last, see Appendix H, p. 355.

The main source for the Letters and Life of Hus, especially the last scenes, was Peter de Mladenowic, the Secretary of John of Chlum (1414–5). In 1427 Mladenowic was banished from Prague as a Calixtine, but in 1439 we find him rector of the University and vicar of St. Michael's. He died in Feb. 1451. His delightful, though at times confused, *Relatio de J. H. causa* was supplemented by a brief Bohemian chronicle found in a Latin version in the *Monumenta*, ii. 344–8. The history of the printed *Relatio* is the history of its adulteration with many elements until first printed by Höfler (*Geschichtsschreiber*), more correctly by Palacky, *Documenta*.

According to Palacky, *Doc.*, p. viii., the first printed edition of the writings of Hus was a quarto brought out at Prague in 1502. This seems very doubtful. I can find no record of it in either Panzer, *Annales Typographici*, or in Græsse, *Trésor de Livres Rares*. The first two printed works of Hus in the British Museum are (i.) *De Causa Boemica*. No date, author, or printer. In reality, a short abbreviation of the *De Ecclesia*, and probably printed about the same time as (ii.) *Liber Egregi US* (sic) *de Unitate Ecclesiæ*. Really the same text as the above. No place or printer given, but, according to Græsse, by J. Schœffer at Mainz. Dated as 1520. In 1525 there followed, from Strassburg [so Græsse; date, place, not given in the work], *Johannis Hus Opuscula*, ed. Otho Brunfels, with a dedication to 'Martin Luther, Apostle of Christ.' This

is as good a specimen of printing as the *Monumenta* is bad. Practically very little of this volume is by Hus. See Appendix H. It was printed from MSS. in the possession of Hutten, and by its mistakes has profoundly influenced later editors. Bound up with this copy in the British Museum is a very rare *Processus Consistorialis Martyris Jo. Hus cum correspondentia legis Gratiæ, et de Victoria Christi*, from the library of Hutten, with curious woodcuts. The work is mentioned in Panzer (p. 425), but no indication of author, date, or place. Perhaps Strassburg, about 1525. The same may be said of the *Epistola liiii.* (sic) *Nobilium Moraviæ pro defensione J. Hus*, one date limit of which is given by an interesting *Epistola familiaris adulescentis cujusdam Constantiensis ad consobrinum*, written from Constance '16 Kal. Jan. 1524,' *i.e.* Dec. 17, 1524. I transcribe a passage of interest from this very rare letter :—

> 'In te ad urbem nostram converte, inspice, agnosce divinum opus. Nam ita si pergat, ut nuper coepit, facile ignominiam suam cum Christi gloria permutabit. Vide enim quam irato episcopo, noster Senatus tuendos susceperit, Evangelistas suos : vide quam non curat illius improbas solicitationes : imo potius hoc vide, ut famelica plebs nostra se erigit, refecta jam nunc corpore et sanguine sui Christi, qui illis exhibitus est per manus Evangelizantium.'

In Nov. 1536 there was printed at Wittenberg, by Josephus Klug, *Tres Epistolæ Sanctissimi Martyris J. Hussii e carcere Constant. ad Boemos scriptæ*, with a preface by Martin Luther. 'Has epistolas,' says Luther, 'Boemica lingua scriptas *curavi* mihi Latines reddi.' In reality, it contains not three, but four epistles, viz. Nos. 85, 83, 71, and 86, in the *Documenta*. It also contains the *Epistle of the Lords of Bohemia and Moravia*, sent on 'Sept. 2, 1416,' with their seals ; a mistake for Sept. 2, 1415. See *Doc.*, p. 580 (the same epistle, it will be noticed, as in the last work, *supra*, which would lead me to date that work as earlier to 1536). Luther knew no

Czech, but does not tell us who did his translation. In 1537 a rival printer, JOHN LUFFT, brought out a larger *Epistolæ Quædam Piissimæ et Eruditissimæ J. Hus*, with a longer preface by Luther. The preface is a thoroughly characteristic piece of work; 'the Bishop of Rome,' it begins, 'if bishop we may call that basilisk of the Church, that pest of the world.' But Luther's editing (for, though anonymous, it contains signs of his hand) is worse than indifferent. The circumstances which led him thus twice within a few months to publish Hus' letters are given by his note: 'ut Theologi ad quodcumque concilium accessuri, tyrannide judicum Constantiensis concilii admoniti cautiores sint.' Luther was expecting at that time a similar Council, convoked for Mantua, which subsequently met at Trent in 1542. This volume contains also the Safe-conduct, and ends with 'The History of the Martyr Hus.' This is Mladenowic's *Relatio*, sadly botched, Latin mended and made more classical, and tales incorporated from floating Hussite tradition—in other words, its historical value largely ruined. Unfortunately it is the basis of most subsequent writers.

In 1558 there was brought out at Nuremberg the anonymous *Historia et Monumenta J. Hus et Hieronymi Pragensis*. This work contains the *Epistolæ Piissimæ*, Brunfels' *J. Hus Opuscula*, Mladenowic's *Relatio* in the corrupted form, as well as many letters, works, etc., published by it for the first time. It necessarily contains, therefore, all the mistakes and misleading documents of the works it incorporates. Marginal notes have been added at the side, which oftentimes exaggerate tendencies, and should not be taken as a substitute for the text. This work, or the edition of 1715, was the basis of all study (Neander and others) until Höfler and Palacky. It is still indispensable. I have used the 1558 edition (cited as "*Mon.*"), but never refer to it where reference to the *Documenta* will serve.

THE FORERUNNERS OF HUS

I

THE key to the understanding of the ecclesiastical history of Bohemia lies in the recognition of intense national consciousness of a Sclavonic race thrown into the midst of German peoples. Along with the Moravians, the Czechs had received the gospel from two sides: in part from Germany, through the missionary labours of the bishops of Passau; in part through the preaching of two natives of Thessalonica—Constantine, better known by the name which he adopted in 868 of Cyril, whose learning won for him also the title of the Philosopher, and his brother Methodius. In 869 Constantine, who had a gift for languages, set off as a missionary to the Chazazs of the Crimea. Thence, in 862, he returned to Rome, bringing with him the remains of the martyr Pope Clement I. In the following year he was sent with his brother to Moravia, henceforth the chief field of their joint labours. But by forming a Sclavonic alphabet, and translating the Gospels

into Sclavonic, the two brothers influenced every Sclavonic people; among others, the duke and people of Bohemia (c. 871).

From the earliest days the religious history of Bohemia was marked by the intense rivalry of Czech and Teuton. In the chronicle of Ludolph of Sagan we read: 'Old is the hatred, and all too deeply rooted, between German and Czech. As the Jew had once no fellowship with the Samaritans, so now the very sight of a German calls forth aversion in the Czech.'[1] Only with reluctance could Constantine obtain for his labours the sanction of the German Bishop of Passau, while Prince Rastislav of Moravia was determined that the Church of his country should not remain a dependency of a Teutonic See. A new bishopric must be founded, of which Constantine should be the first bishop. Owing to the heresy of Photius, the Patriarch of Constantinople, Constantine and Methodius were driven to accept the invitation to Rome of the astute Nicholas I., though otherwise they would probably have allied themselves with the Eastern Church.[2] So in 868 the two

[1] *Op. cit.* 84. On the Germans in Bohemia, see Höfler, *Abzug*, i. 3–89. For Constantine and Methodius, see Bury's Gibbon, vi. appendix 12, with bibliography.

[2] All memory of the Eastern Church had died out before Hus. This against the theory that Hus was a return to that Church. See Lützow, *Boh. Lit.*, 137.

brothers obtained consecration from Hadrian II., the recognition of national dioceses, and permission to use the vernaculars in public worship. But the German faction did not surrender their claims without a struggle. Twice they branded Methodius—Cyril had died in Rome—as a heretic, and drove him to vindicate his faith and authority at the Lateran. For a time the Germans were worsted: the Sclavonic Church seemed cut off from all Teutonic intermeddling. But in 908 the invasion of the Huns destroyed the Sclavonic power, and left German influences supreme both in Moravia and Bohemia. The bishopric of Prague was filled with Germans and subjected to the distant archbishopric of Mainz. The use of the Sclavonic ritual was forbidden, the monks who adhered to it expelled, and Latin Christianity forced upon an unwilling people.[1]

The struggle between Czechs and Teutons did not grow less with lapse of years. The Slavs resented the increasing pressure of the German ele-

[1] According to Gieseler, ii. 458 n. 17, one convent in Prague still retains the vernacular. Cyril (d. Feb. 14, 869) is buried in the Church of St. Clement in Rome, in whose wonderful lower church is a fresco of his funeral, with Pope Nicholas I. walking in the procession (Hare, *Walks in Rome*, i. 369). Nicholas had died, however, in 867. Cyril's alphabet is technically called Glagolitic; the so-called "Cyrillic" was invented half a century later by Bp. Clement of Drenoviza. Methodius died in 885.

ments upon their territory, usages, and languages; the Germans could not forgive the election of Charles IV. of Luxembourg, king of Bohemia, to the crown of the Empire. Charles IV. reawakened the national consciousness: he sacrificed the Empire to his hereditary kingdom, on which he bestowed laws and institutions, and whose capital he enriched with stately churches, palaces, and bridges.[1] We see the same spirit of nationalism in the efforts by which Charles, or rather his father, the blind King John,—the restless adventurer who fell at Crecy,—procured from Clement VI., an old friend of Charles', the constitution of Prague as a Metropolitan See, and the severance of the dependence, centuries old, upon the Archbishop of Mainz (April 30, 1344). Even more important was his foundation in 1347–8, by papal bull and imperial charter, of the University of Prague,—'that stream of Paradise which should water the whole earth,'[2]—'that the Bohemians,

[1] For a description of Prague at the end of the fourteenth century, see Denis, *op. cit.* 487–93. Its population "did not count less than 100,000 inhabitants." With Wylie (iii. 477), I would reduce by half. See Vol. i. p. 297, and for the number at its University, *infra*, p. 116, which Denis, *op. cit.* 88 n. 2, again wonderfully exaggerates.

[2] *Doc.*, 693. The Carolinum was founded and endowed for twelve masters in 1366. Rashdall, *Univs. in M.A.*, ii. 218–9. See also Höfler, *Abzug*, 93–112.

who ceaselessly hunger after the fruits of knowledge, may find the table spread for them in their own land, without being compelled to beg abroad.' As the first University founded in Germany, Prague rapidly attracted vast crowds of students, variously estimated by medieval inaccuracy at from 7000–44,000, but more probably never exceeding 2000, even in the palmy days before the split. For Bohemia the reign of Charles IV. was the golden age of her history.[1] He justified the sneer of the Emperor Maximilian: "a model of a father to Bohemia, and of a stepfather to Germany." He it was who, in the famous phrase of Bryce, by his Golden Bull "legalised anarchy, and called it a constitution." [2]

As Charles IV. had studied at Paris, Paris and not Bologna formed the model of the Prague and the German Universities. They were Universities of masters and not students;[3] theology and not law formed the dominant study. The point is not without importance. From law universities after the model of Bologna no religious awakening, or movement of Reform, has ever proceeded. The

[1] See Sagan's panegyric, pp. 66–7.

[2] Bryce, *H.R.E.*, 238. For the Golden Bull, see *ibid.* 230 ff. The Bull itself is in Brown, *Fasciculus*, i. 108–23. For Charles IV., see also Höfler, *Abzug*, 78–89.

[3] For the distinction, see my *Ch. of West*, ii. 257–8.

Universities of Italy produced canonists and cardinals without number; genuine Reformers of the first rank, none. The case is otherwise with the Paris type: Oxford has her Wyclif, Paris her Gerson and Gallican school, Prague her Hus, and Erfurt her Luther, each of them the leaders in a larger movement born in the Schools.

From the first the new University was divided, after the model of Paris, into the four nations of Bohemians, Bavarians, Saxons, and Poles. At Prague the division was more than nominal: in the streets, constant faction fights between Czech and Teuton; in the schools, whatever the one espoused the other condemned. The Germans embraced Nominalism: of itself a sufficient reason for the Czechs to become uncompromising Realists. Thus in the University there grew up a national party, prepared to defend the works of a thorough-going Realist like Wyclif against the attacks of German Nominalists.

This academic struggle would probably not have advanced beyond the limits of medieval orthodoxy but for the existence in the University city of a popular religious movement. This revival, like the national revolt with which it afterwards coalesced, began in the efforts of Charles IV. Charles, "the priests' kaiser," 'protector of the Church, lover of the clergy, builder

of churches,' as Hus called him,[1] had well deserved his name by the munificence of his gifts and ecclesiastical foundations, as well as his love of theological controversy. But if he endowed the Church with dangerous wealth,[2] he also sought to restore the discipline and morality of its clergy. The state of the Bohemian Church was in truth deplorable; the exaggerations of Reformers are almost warranted by the evidence of the official statutes.[3] At the head of the new national Church Charles placed Ernest of Pardubitz, as the first Archbishop of Prague (1344–1364), whose talent for organisation was not less than his zeal for reform. One of his statutes (1355) is significant of the new movement. The parish priests are required to make use of the national language in their sermons on Sundays and holy days, as also in the reading of the Creed and the Lord's Prayer.[4] To assist Ernest in his task,

[1] Commemoration Sermon, *Monumenta*, ii. 41.

[2] The statement of Hus that a fourth of the country belonged to the Church cannot be relied on. See *infra*, 176 n. According to Denis, *op. cit.* 9, there were 110 convents in Bohemia.

[3] See Loserth, 11–20, 295–301; and cf. Hus's exaggerated complaints in Nowotny, *op. cit.* (*Feast Days*), i. 7–9, 27, 45, ii. 29, 49, 90. This last is particularly absurd: 'Many popes, archbishops, cardinals, bishops, deans, and priests who cannot read!' Hus, like other rhetoricians, scores sometimes at the expense of accuracy.

[4] Loserth, 12.

Charles persuaded, in 1358, a famous preacher, Conrad, a monk of Waldhausen in Austria, to settle in Prague. There for ten years, in the famous Teyn Church,[1] he denounced the vices of the age, especially the luxury of the women, passionately but vainly assailed by the friars, whose churches he had emptied, whose avarice he had exposed. The doctrine of the Church, however, he left severely alone. He died (Dec. 8, 1369) deeply bewailed by both Germans and Czechs, and even by the Jews, who were accustomed in large numbers to attend his services.[2]

Even more powerful was the influence of another preacher, Milicz of Kremsier in Moravia, archdeacon and canon of Prague, secretary[3] and friend of Charles. In 1363, realising, in

[1] For a picture of it, see Baker, *op. cit.* 78. "Teyn" is Czech for "bazaar."

[2] Conrad's public sermons have been lost, but a series of seventy-three rather academic discourses,—with disquisitions on the siege of Numantia, modes of calculating Easter, etc.,—prepared to assist young priests in sermon preparation, have been preserved for us. This *Postil of the Prague Students*, as it is called, is in part a running commentary on the Gospel for the day, in part model "skeletons," widely used long after his death. See Loserth, *op. cit.* 23–31.

[3] Not "chancellor," as Neander, ix. 250. He was only in the chancery as *registrator* and *corrector* (1358–1363). See Loserth, *op. cit.* 33.

spite of his austerities, that his life was too worldly, Milicz resigned all his benefices and retired as curate to a village near Pilsen. Ernest reluctantly witnessed his departure. 'What better can you do,' he pleaded, 'than help your poor archbishop in tending the flock committed to him.' Milicz disciplined himself for six months, returned to Prague, and began to preach to the people. His sermons were at first but poorly attended: his Moravian pronunciation repelled. His friends urged him to withdraw. 'If I can but save one soul,' Milicz replied, 'I shall be satisfied.'[1] His zeal was at length rewarded with success. 'After this visitation,' we read, 'of the spirit of Christ, he grew so rich in wisdom and all utterance of doctrine that it was an easy matter for him to preach five times a day—once in Latin, once in German, then again in Bohemian.'[2] His moral earnestness was intense. A quarter of Prague devoted wholly to brothels —"Little Venice," as it was called, after the notorious mistress of the seas—was reclaimed by his zeal, and a Magdalene Hospital erected in its place, to which the people gave the title of "Little Jerusalem."[3] 'O, how many vices,' continues

[1] Balb., 45 [2] Balb., 46.

[3] Balb., 55–6; Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 170 n. He had learned German in order to preach to the Germans. Balb., 47.

Mathias of Janow, 'conquered by him, had to give up the field. I confess I cannot enumerate the tenth part of what my own eyes saw, my own ears heard, though I lived with him but a short time.'

As the years went on, the tone of Milicz became more mystical. He desired even to give up preaching, and enter a monastery that he might 'crucify the flesh and take up the Cross of Christ.' From this he was dissuaded by his friends; so turned to the study of the Apocalypse. His imagination, keenly sensitive to the evils around him, was filled with the coming of Antichrist. He felt that he was the prophet of a new crusade against the Beast. He went so far as to inform Charles that he was Antichrist. In 1367 he journeyed to Rome that he might bear testimony before Urban v., and advise the calling of a General Council for reformation. As the Pope still tarried at Avignon, Milicz, as we learn from his own writings, posted up a notice on the door of St. Peter's 'that Antichrist had come.'[1] For this he was imprisoned by the Inquisition, and occupied his time in writing — 'a prisoner in chains, troubled in spirit, longing for the freedom

[1] Pal. *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 167 n.: 'Primo quod ipse tenuit quod in 1366 Antichristus fuisset natus'; cf. *ibid.* 168 n., and Balb., 50.

of Christ's Church'—his work *De Antichristo.*[1] The frequent absurdities of its utterance—judged, that is, by modern ideas—should not hide from us its revolutionary tendency. This does not lie so much in what is said, for there is but little with which a severe inquisitor could have found fault, as in its general affinity with the whole writings of the Spiritual Franciscans. From their constant 'anatomy' and emphasis of Antichrist, it was but a step to the attaching of Antichrist to the Papacy itself,—a step which Wyclif, at anyrate, was not slow to take.[2]

On the arrival of Urban, Milicz—who had already preached a sort of trial sermon in St. Peter's—was set free, even treated with distinction.[3] He returned to Prague, dropped his prophecies, set up a school for preachers, and gave himself entirely to his religious duties at the Teyn Church. His charity was boundless. He gave all he had, selling even his books and clothes that he might have the more to bestow.[4]

[1] For this work, better called *Anatomia Antichristi*, see Appendix H. At one time Milicz seems to have had an antipathy to study. Höfler, *Abzug*, 105.

[2] The strongest paragraph of the *Anatomia* is i. 363*a*. Milicz never identifies Antichrist with the Papacy. His nearest approach is i. 366*a*., where, following Lyra, he identifies Babylon and Rome.

[3] Balb., 51.

[4] Balb., 49.

'When I think,' he said, 'of the fervent penitence of that poor woman,' referring to a harlot he had saved, 'the bitterest cup becomes sweet to me.' But his piety did not disarm his enemies, who forwarded to the Pope twelve charges against him.[1] They succeeded at last in obtaining Bulls from Gregory XI. condemning his teaching 'as mischievous and dangerous to the faithful, especially the simple.' Milicz, confident in his right, repaired to Avignon. He died there while his case was still undecided (June 29, 1374). The numerous manuscripts of his sermons, ethical rather than theological, witness to their lasting popularity.

The influence of Milicz and Conrad lay chiefly in their fervent oratory. Their revival was not designedly a revolt against existing conditions. But Mathias of Janow, prebendary of Prague, a Bohemian knight, for nine years[2] a student at Paris, a friend of the reforming Archbishop of Prague, John of Jenzenstein, was a systematic theologian, whose work *De Regulis Veteris et Novi Testamenti* (1389),[3] in spite of its constant protestations of orthodoxy, struck a blow at some of the foundation principles of the medieval Church.

[1] Balb., 59.

[2] Loserth, 43 n. 3, compared with 305–6.

[3] For this work and its author, see Appendix H.

'From his youth upwards,' he tells us, 'he had loved the Bible, and called it his friend and bride.'[1] From the Bible alone, disregarding the traditions of the Church, he now proceeded, in a somewhat rambling and disconnected fashion, to draw out the practice of Christianity, 'and expose the hidden shame of the mother of harlots.' Though he wrote in Latin,—he frequently preached, however, in Czech,—he appealed, like Milicz, whose life he compiled, 'to the simple people in Christ,' for whom, as he tells us, 'his work was alone intended.' He advocated a return 'to those sound and simple beginnings, where it would be needful to retain but a few, and those only the apostolic, laws.' He deprecated the overloading of the Church with ecclesiastical ordinances and laws: 'men nowadays are more afraid to transgress one of these than the commandments of God Himself.' He looked forward to a time, 'close at hand,' when 'the works of men, ordinances, and ceremonies will be utterly extirpated, cut up by the roots and cease, and God alone will be exalted.' He therefore holds up distinctly the immediate reference of the religious consciousness to Christ, and deplores the efforts of men 'to attain to justification by many labours with much expense,' whereby 'Christ becomes to

[1] Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 177 n.

their hearts as one dead.' Though he leaves the hierarchical system untouched, he yet maintains 'that every Christian is an anointed man and a priest': the peasant pasturing the cattle can serve the Lord as fully as the priest administering the sacraments. Because of this equality of Christian status, Janow urged upon the laity the frequent participation in the Lord's Supper, at that time a matter of sore controversy. The clerics feared lest by this means the laity 'should be put on a level with the priests,' and at the Synod of Prague (1389) had decreed that the sacrament should not be administered to the faithful more frequently than once a month.[1] In the partaking of the sacrament Janow insisted that the most important qualification is great simplicity of faith. Finally, he will have nothing to do with the 'corrupting' doctrine 'that people ought piously to believe that a divine power resides in wooden images and painted canvas.' His doctrines naturally gave offence. He was compelled to read a retraction before the Synod of Prague (Oct. 18, 1389), and was suspended from his duties for half a year.[2] 'All that now remains for us,' he wrote, 'is to pray for reform

[1] For this Synod and the controversy over the sacrament, see Loserth, 53–63.

[2] For this retraction, see Appendix H, pp. 356–7.

by the destruction of Antichrist himself, and to lift up our heads, for our redemption draweth nigh.' He died at Prague, Nov. 30, 1394, and is buried in the cathedral. An early tradition of the Moravian Church tells us that as his death approached 'he gave this comfort to his friends: The rage of the enemies of truth hath now prevailed against us. But this shall not be always. For an ignoble people shall arise, without sword or power, over whom they shall not be able to prevail.' [1]

II

Our review of these leaders—and others might be mentioned did space allow [2]—has shown the existence in Bohemia, at the close of the fourteenth century, of a deep religious movement—unconscious, it is true, of any desire for revolt, which, as Andrew of Brod told Hus, kept within the safe bounds of denunciation of the 'grievous irregularities of the clergy,[3] but which needed

[1] Schweinitz, 26, evidently an amplification of the sentence I have previously quoted.

[2] *E.g.*, John of Stekna, long confused with Conrad of Waldhausen (see Palacky, *Verläufer*, 82 ff.). Hus refers to his 'trumpet voice' in his rhetorical *Commemoration Sermon for Charles IV.* (*Mon.*, ii. 41). To call Stekna a Reformer, however, would seem a misnomer (Loserth, 51–2).

[3] See his remarkable letter, *Doc.*, 520.

little to turn it into actual revolution. The coincidence of these three connected movements —the national revival that dates from Charles IV., the struggle of Czech and Teuton in the University and the corresponding conflict in the Empire between Wenzel and Rupert, and the religious awakening among the people—gave Hus and his fellow-workers much of their strength and importance; at the same time, confused the issue by complications not a few. What further was needed was supplied by the rapid spread in Bohemia of the writings of Wyclif, the corruption of the Bohemian clergy, the general low esteem in which they were held, not unmingled with a desire to lay hands on their excessive wealth, and, lastly, by the fact that Bohemia was saturated with the doctrines of the Waldenses.[1] Nor should we overlook the incapacity of Archbishop Zbinek Zazic of Hasenburg, a prelate weak though well intentioned, more at home in the camp than the church. Add also the anarchic reign of the drunkard Wenzel. Other lesser factors might be detailed. But the chief cause of the success of

[1] Pastor, i. 157; Lea, *Inquis.*, ii. 427–31. The existence of these heretics is stoutly denied by Hus, who probably dreaded the being confused with them. I see no evidence in *Doc.*, 342, 184, that Hus knew Waldensian doctrines, as Denis, 77 n. 3, thinks.

Wyclif's revolt in Bohemia, as distinct from his failure in England, lies in the fact that in Bohemia his disciples found a great national party,[1] with the maintenance of which his principles became identified, while in England his followers drifted into doctrines which, rightly or wrongly, seemed anti-nationalistic to the victors of Agincourt. Politics in the one case gave the success, in the other was the cause of failure. The events of history are rarely simple. Least of all are they simple in the complex sphere of religious life.

We have referred to Wenzel.[2] No account of the age of Hus would be adequate which did not give some notice of this extraordinary king. The great object of his father, Charles IV., was the aggrandisement of the house of Luxembourg. He had already secured the crown of Bohemia: only by reason of debt did his line miss the retaining of Brandenburg. Silesia they had wrung from Poland by 'purchase and entreaty.'

[1] Very important in this connection is Thomas Stitny, on whose Czech writings see Lützow, *Boh. Lit.*, 63–79.

[2] For Wenzel's character, see Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 66–70. For the passionate accusations of Sagan, see *op. cit.* 74–9, 81, 118, 77: 'Non tam rex quam carnifix.' For the charges brought by Archbishop Jenzenstein against him, see Pelzel, *op. cit.* i. doc. 116. Denis, 55, says: "There were two Wenzels —the one serious, benevolent, just; the other furious, full of contradictory caprices."

For the same purpose Charles published, in 1356, the so-called Golden Bull, reducing the electors of the Empire to seven, one of whom was the king of Bohemia. By means of this Bull, and by his close alliance with the Church, Charles hoped to secure the imperial throne for his race. Thus he would play the part which, on his failure, fell to the house of Hapsburg. His second son, Sigismund, Charles had married to Mary, heiress of Hungary and Polland. With his fortunes we shall deal later. Sigismund's elder half-brother Wenzel, through Charles' bribes, was chosen king of the Romans, and succeeded his father as Emperor in 1378. The Germans finally deposed him, in disgust (May 25, 1400), electing in his place the Palatine Rupert. But Bohemia could not so easily get rid of her maniac lord.

With all his faults, Wenzel was true to the Czechs, who for this reason pardoned many things. Once, however, they revolted against him, and put him in prison. He escaped by the help of a boatman's daughter. As Emperor, Wenzel's one achievement was the sale of Milan to the Visconti, and the final severance of its connection with the Empire. He spent his time in 'drinking beer and dancing with the girls,' or taming savage hounds, with whom he shared his

bedroom.[1] Like his father, he was fond of theological argument; but, unlike his father, was no friend of the Church. His second wife, Sophie of Bavaria, showed a real insight into his character when, on her marriage (1389), she brought with her to Prague a waggon-load of skilful conjurers and jugglers.[2] Her influence was considerable, and was steadily exerted on behalf of the Reformers, whose leader, John Hus, she chose as her chaplain. But neither Sophie nor Hus could tell in what direction the mad caprice of Wenzel would next break out.

One of Wenzel's fits of passion led to revolts closely connected with the fate of Hus. Wenzel had created his favourite, John of Jenzenstein, Archbishop of Prague (1378). The old story of Becket and Henry was once more repeated. In one of their quarrels (1393) Wenzel seized the archbishop and three of his followers, and ordered them to be drowned. On realising the consequences, the archbishop was released, but ultimately driven into banishment in Italy. One of the archbishop's attendants—John Welflin of Pomuck—was, however, tortured, and by Wenzel's orders thrown into the Moldau. To this act of

[1] On Dec. 31, 1386, they tore his first wife, Joanna, to pieces in the bedroom.

[2] See the extraordinary stories, Lea, *op. cit.* iii. 460.

tyranny and sacrilege the country at the time was profoundly indifferent.[1] In the seventeenth century the Jesuits, on the look-out for some national saint to dispossess the memory of Hus, chose for the purpose this same John of Pomuc. He was, they said, a confessor of Queen Joanna, drowned by her husband's orders because he refused to violate the secrets of the confessional. The legend accomplished its end. The tourist in Bohemia to-day will here and there come across groups of peasants praying before an old image. Closer examination will show that it is in reality a statue of John Hus, altered and adapted to suit the new saint of Jesuit legend.[2]

[1] Hus was as indifferent as the others. *Doc.*, 165. 'A mighty thing that those parsons (popones, Ger. Pfaffen) are imprisoned. Tell me a reason why the service of God should be discontinued.'

[2] Baker, *Pictures in Bohemia*, p. 136. For J. N., see Wratislaw's *Life of John Nepomucen*, and for the Roman version, miracles, hymns, etc., the *Breviary* for May 16. Canonised March 19, 1729. This growth of a legend is so interesting that I have given a short examination of it in Appendix K, p. 358.

CHAPTER IV

HUS AND THE TROUBLES IN PRAGUE

O virum ineffabilem, venerande praefulgentem speculo sanctitatis. O virum humilem magnae pietatis radio coruscantem; qui contemptor divitiarum usque ad excussum sinum pauperibus ministrabat; qui genua pronus flectere ad egenorum lectos non recusabat; qui lacrymis duros ad poenitentiam provocabat, animosque feroces ineffabili dulcedine mulcendo mitigabat; qui vitia generaliter cunctorum, praesertim superbi cupidi et opulenti Cleri, antiquis et oblitis scripturarum remediis quasi novo quodam et inaudito incentivo ex magna charitate funditus exurebat, apostolicisque innixus vestigiis tota sua cura primaevae Ecclesiae mores in Clero restaurabat et populo.

In omnibus Magister vitae sine pari.

Testimonium Univ. Prag., May 23, 1416 (*Mon.*, i. 80–82).

F The general authorities are given at length in Chapter III. We add here a few references on special points.

For Adalbert Ranconis, see LOSERTH, *W. and H.*, 38–41, and especially LOSERTH, *Beiträge zur Ges. der Hus Bewegung* (Vienna, 1880), vol. ii., with large extracts from ADALBERT'S *Apology*.

W. BERGER, *John Hus and König Sigismund* (Augsburg, 1871), is chiefly a defence of Sigismund, incidentally of value over other matters.

For John's Indulgence and the point at issue (the question of '*a culpa et a pœna*'), see LEA, *History of Auricular Confession and Indulgences*, 1896, vol. iii., espec. iii. 54–80.

For the University of Prague and the Secession, see RASHDALL, *Universities in M.A.*, ii. 212–32, and HÖFLER, *Abzug.* (see *supra*, p. 89), especially pp. 93–112, 217–51. The question of the number who seceded seems settled by the recent publication of G. ERLER, *Die Matrikel der Universität Leipzig*, 2 vols. [In the *Codex Diplomaticus Saxoniæ Regiæ*, Zweiter Haupttheil xvi. Band.] From these lists we see that the total number of registrations at Leipzig in 1409 was 369; in 1410 was 248. The 1409 list includes 45 graduates of other Universities—presumably, therefore, all the seceding Prague magisters. Of the rest, 47 were 'Pragenses,' 51 'pauperes.' Putting the winter and the summer sessions together, the entrances were but 507. (See Introd., i. p. lxxxi, and p. xc, for comparison with other German Universities. Erfurt at that time had 322 only). One more medieval fiction is thus destroyed. Creighton's moderate estimate of 2000 (ii. 8) must therefore be considerably reduced.

On the theological and philosophical standpoint of Hus, I have not dwelt at any length. To have done this would have been to repeat, for the most part, my exposition of Wyclif in Volume I.

HUS AND THE TROUBLES IN PRAGUE

When I was a tyro at Erfurt I found in the library of the convent a volume of the Sermons of John Hus. When I read the title I had a great curiosity to know what doctrines that heresiarch had propagated, since a volume like this in a public library had been saved from the fire. On reading, I was overwhelmed with astonishment. I could not understand for what cause they had burnt so great a man, who explained the Scriptures with so much gravity and skill. But as the very name of Hus was held in so great abomination that I imagined the sky would fall and the sun be darkened if I made honourable mention of him, I shut the book and went away with no little indignation. This, however, was my comfort, that perhaps Hus had written these things before he fell into heresy. For as yet I knew not what was done at the Council of Constance.—LUTHER: Preface, *Monumenta*, vol. i.

I

JOHN OF HUSINEC—a name which he abbreviated, except in formal documents, into the more familiar Hus—was the child of poor parents of Husinec,[1] a village of Bohemia not far

[1] Husinec was one of twenty-four villages belonging jointly to the Crown and the barons of Janowic. From the first, therefore, Hus was under civil and not ecclesiastical influences. Pal. *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 305 n. I have not related the early tales

from the Bavarian frontier.[1] On entering the University of Prague, Hus supported himself, as Luther at Erfurt, by singing in the churches and by menial services. His piety at this time, though sincere, was of the usual type. In 1392 we find him parting with his last four groschen to a seller of indulgences at the Wyschehrad,[2] 'so that there remained only dry bread for his support.'[3] 'This year of Jubilee,' adds the chronicle, 'has emptied the pockets of the poor.' In his later years Hus reproached himself with his youthful levity: 'You know, alas! how I wasted my time in

about Hus. They can be read in Lenfant, *C.C.*, Becker, *op. cit.* 9–19, or Gillett, *op. cit.* i. 43–7, and are valueless. Some have a suspicious resemblance to similar tales over Luther; others are manifestly coined from the fact that Hus in Czech = goose. For all, I can find no authority save tradition. Some nephews were still alive at Hus' death. Hus was anxious to 'put them to a trade,' for he did not think they would 'guard an ecclesiastical calling as they ought' (*Doc.*, 120).

[1] Date of birth unknown. Usually accepted on late evidence as July 6, 1369. July 6 is really the date of his death and feast-day. But Loserth, 67 n. 3, is scarcely conclusive against the usual year. For description of the house, Baker, *op. cit.* 138.

[2] Part of Prague. See Appendix L: Prague in the Time of Hus.

[3] Höfler, *Geschicht*, i. 15. This is the Sale of Indulgences of which Niem, *Vita Joannis* (Hardt, ii. 342–3), gives us particulars. In one town in Saxony they netted 8000 florins. Niem was indignant. Hus refers to it in *Mon.*, i. 293*b*.

games of chess, frittering away my time, and provoking myself and others to anger.'[1] Such reproaches are rather the evidence of a tender conscience than of any real depravity of heart. In 1396 he took his Master's degree, and two years later began to deliver lectures as a public teacher. In 1401 he was made dean of the faculty of philosophy, and in the following year the rector of the University, a position he occupied for about six months. Nevertheless, his achievements at the University were in nowise remarkable. He never took his degree of doctor, while the wide knowledge that appears in his writings is but the borrowed learning of Wyclif.[2]

In 1400 Hus obtained priest's orders; his object, he tells us, was the comfortable life led by the clergy.[3] Two years later he was appointed preacher at the Chapel of the Holy Innocents of Bethlehem.[4] This appointment gave Hus his

[1] *Doc.*, 74.

[2] Against Neander, x. 346.

[3] *Doc.*, 722; and for the date, cf. *Mon.*, i. 39*b*, with *Doc.*, 165.

[4] March 14, 1402. For its deed of gift, see Pelzel, i. doc. 81, part of which is quoted by Hus, *Doc.*, 394; cf. *ibid.* 340–1. We must beware of supposing there was no Czech preaching in Prague before. See Loserth, 69 n. 1. The new place of Czech is seen in the writings of Thomas Stitny (d. 1400), *ibid.* 42–3; Lützow, *Boh. Lit.*, 63–79. For preachers at Prague before Hus, Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 182 n.

opportunity. The Bethlehem Chapel in Prague —a vast building, destroyed in 1786 [1]—had been erected and endowed in 1391 by two wealthy laymen, on the condition that its rector should be a secular, and preach, every Sunday and festival, exclusively in the Czech language. Thus the chapel—'Bethlehem, which is being interpreted "House of Bread," because there the common people should be refreshed with the bread of preaching'—was both the product and expression of the new consciousness of Czech nationalism and of the recent religious revival. Like the Bethlehem, almost everything in Prague was new. The whole town was seething with a new life, of which the movement led by Hus was but one outlet.

From the first, the sermons of Hus were held in high repute. Thirteen years later he could refer to copies made of some 'in the first year of my preaching.' From the first, also, he flung himself into the national movement. In 1401 the German forces of the anti-Kaiser Rupert, under the Margrave of Meissen,—not without encouragement from Wenzel's rebel nobles,—besieged Prague, 'burning villages and killing poor Bohemians.' The young preacher rang out

[1] By the Jesuits. Hus had a dwelling-room in it, to which a staircase led direct from the pulpit.

a call to arms: 'The Czechs,' he cried, in one of his sermons,

> 'in this part are more wretched than dogs or snakes; for a dog defends the couch on which he lies, and if another dog tries to drive him away, he fights with him. A snake does the same. But we let the Germans oppress us, and occupy all the offices, without complaint.'[1]

The third factor in the work of Hus was supplied by his becoming acquainted with the works of Wyclif. Almost from its foundation there had existed links closely connecting Prague with Oxford. We have an illustration of this in the scholarships for Czech students at the English University, founded by that warm supporter of the national movement, Adalbert Ranconis.[2] The growing intercourse received a powerful stimulus by the marriage, in January 1382, of Richard II. of England with Anne, the sister of Wenzel of Bohemia. The alliance was the work of Urban VI., who dreaded lest Bohemia should ally itself with France, and thus acknowledge his rival at Avignon.[3] By the irony of fate this papal marriage was destined to work much harm to the Papacy: for the Bohemian attendants of Anne,

[1] *Doc.*, 177, 175.

[2] See Loserth, 40–1. Date, March 4, 1388. For Adalbert, cf. *ibid.* 38–40, and cf. *supra*, p. 116.

[3] Walsingham, i. 452.

as well as the travelling students, carried home to Prague the writings of Wyclif. The precise year in which these were introduced cannot now be determined. In 1411, in his controversy with the Englishman Stokes, Hus informs us that 'members of this University and myself have possessed and read those works for twenty years now, and more.' The date is as vague as the reference, which, however, probably denotes only the philosophical works of the heresiarch. Of these, five tractates, written out by Hus himself in 1398, are now in the Royal Library at Stockholm. According to Hus, it was not until 'twelve years later' that the theological writings of Wyclif were known in Bohemia. In that year (Autumn, 1401) Jerome of Prague, who in 1398 had obtained his licentiate and permission to go abroad, came back from Oxford, bringing with him copies of Wyclif's *Dialogue* and *Trialogue*,[1] together with some other lesser

[1] Hardt, iv. 634, 651. On this matter of dates, see *Mon.*, i. 108*a* ; *Doc.*, 280. I can find no authority for Creighton's statement that "the writings of Wyclif were brought to Prague as early as 1385 by Jerome of Prague" [i. 360]. This seems impossible. Neander, x. 348, speaks of Prague as possessing the works for 'thirty years' from 1381. He has misread *Mon.*, i. 108, which refers to Oxford, as is clear from the context and *Mon.*, i. 109*b*, 110*a*. His "Count" Faulfisch is a further confusion, due to Æneas Sylvius, *Hist. Boh.*, c. 35.

works whose names are given. All these Jerome had written out with his own hand. 'Young men and students,' he said in a public disputation, 'who did not study the books of Wyclif would never find the true root of knowledge.' In this conviction he introduced the works to John Christan of Prachaticz and John Hus.[1]

Before long the strife over Wyclif had broken out in Bohemia. On May 28, 1403, the rector of the University, after a sharp debate in the Carolinum, issued an order forbidding discussion of the twenty-four articles extracted from Wyclif's works, already condemned at the Earthquake Synod, to which were further added twenty-one extracted by Hübner, a Silesian master.[2] The prohibition remained a dead letter. The whole affair, in fact, seems to have been an attempt by the German Nominalists to score over the Czech Realists, who, for their part, contented themselves

For other variations of the same tale, see Loserth, 72–3. Sagan, 84, says: 'Nescio quo portante.' That Jerome was home in 1401, see *Doc.*, 175. Additional evidence of date as 1401 is given in Hardt, iv. 651, where, in the official charges against Jerome, the first year of his teaching Wyclifism is put as 1401. On the whole subject, see Höfler, *Abzug*, 138–66, especially 158–9; Palacky, *Hussitenthums*, 113–6.

[1] Hardt, iv. 650, 652.

[2] *Doc.*, 327–31, 730. (Cf. *F.Z.*, 277.) Note *Doc.*, 328, is misleading. The Earthquake, or Blackfriars, Synod met May 21, 1382. See Vol. i. p. 188.

with protesting, rather unfairly, that the condemned propositions, at anyrate the additions of Hübner, were not to be found in Wyclif. Among these Realists or Wyclifists we must already reckon John Hus, 'for these books of the Evangelical Doctor, as is known from credible witnesses, opened the eyes of Master John Hus of blessed memory whilst reading and re-reading the same in connection with his adherents.'[1] 'Such falsifiers of books,' Hus burst out, with reference to the forty-five articles, 'better deserve to be burnt than those adulterators of saffron, Berlin, and Wlaska'—a curious sidelight on the social barbarism of the age, and of the unconsciousness of Hus and the Realists as to the real drift of the doctrines of Wyclif, which they professed to hold.[2] The Wyclifists, as Stephen Dolein complained, swarmed everywhere—'in state apartments of princes, the schools of the students, the lonely chambers of the monks, and the cells of the Carthusians.'[3] Large sums of money were paid for manuscripts of the English doctor, and corrected copies were constantly brought from England.[4] So rapid was the spread of his doctrines that in 1406 Zbinek,

[1] Höfler, *Geschichtsschreiber*, ii. 593 (a Taborite document).
[2] *Doc.*, 179. [3] *Medulla*, 158.
[4] *Doc.*, 389; Poole, *De Dom. Div.*, p. x.

acting on the orders of Innocent VII., threatened with punishment all those who preached the heresies of the Reformer, and ordered that the Roman dogma of the Sacrament should be proclaimed to the people on the next Feast of Corpus Christi.[1]

The struggle over Wyclif was as yet political rather than religious. The race-feud, of which it was the expression, came to a head in 1409, in the memorable split in the University. The cause of this schism should not be misunderstood. Owing to the violence of the Czechs, the reader's sympathies are usually with the expelled Germans. They are regarded as the victims of a strident nationalism. But in reality the grievances of the Czechs were many. Not only the Carolinum, but the college founded by Wenzel in 1386, as well as the new college founded in 1397 by Queen Hedwig of Poland (*infra*, p. 160) for poor students from Lithuania, were being filled with Germans, in defiance of the intentions of their founders. Nor was this all. As Jerome pointed out at Constance: 'No Czech could get a prebend'; 'A Czech graduate, if he had no private means, had to travel through towns and villages, teaching scholars,' for the Church was

[1] *Doc.*, 730, 335 (with text corrected, Loserth, 95 n.; cf. Dolein, *Medulla*, 158).

closed against him. This last fact alone will more than explain the revolt against Rome. The Bohemian Church was fast becoming an alien or German institution, slipping back into the dependence from which Charles IV. had rescued it.[1]

There were wheels within wheels, not without influence on the future of Hus. Wenzel found that Gregory XII. continued to recognise his rival Rupert as king of the Romans. So he determined to side with the cardinals at Pisa, at least to the extent that he would remain neutral.[2] For a similar but opposite reason the Germans remained faithful to Gregory and the Rhenish Kaiser. This in itself was sufficient to induce the Bohemian "nation" to follow Hus when he took up the idea of Wenzel, and brought it before the University. The Czechs found that they were powerless: they had but one vote. The Bavarians and Saxons controlled the Senate, and had the support of Zbinek and the clergy, who discerned clearly the danger to themselves in the triumph of Wyclifist Realism. The Czechs,

[1] Hardt, iv. 757–8; Rashdall, *Univs.*, ii. 218–21; Höfler, *Abzug*, 93–112. To add to the complications, we must remember the law students had formed, since 1372, a separate University of their own, with a separate rector, after the manner of Bologna (Rashdall, ii. 216; Höfler, 111).

[2] Nov. 24, 1408. See his letter, *Doc.*, 843. In *Lab. Supl.*, iii. 906, Mansi has dated wrongly.

who had long groaned at the ascendency of strangers, judged the present a suitable time, by the help of Wenzel,[1] to establish their supremacy. Under the lead of Hus, whose patriotism was of a fervent, not to say noisy, order,—'I prefer a good German to a bad Czech' is in this his utmost concession to charity,[2]—they brought Wenzel to decree that the Bohemians should have three votes, the other nations but one. Drunkard though he was, Wenzel hesitated to destroy the great creation of his father. In one of his angry fits he even threatened to burn Hus and Jerome.[3] Through mortification or overstrain Hus took to his bed. 'Oh, Hus,' cried one of his friends, 'is there no one who will be our deliverer?' 'If I die,' answered Hus, 'insist on justice and the freedom of our nation.'[4]

[1] The idea was impressed upon Wenzel by an envoy of Charles VI. of France, who had come to plead the cause of Pisa. His oration, 'at the order of Christan Prachaticz, was written out by Magister Hus' in his own hand. See Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 174–87.

[2] *Doc.*, 168; cf. 177, 181, 724 (8). For the lead of Hus, see *Doc.*, 354 (in Hus's own hand), and *Doc.*, 181, 19. The interesting 'defence of the mandate,' *Doc.*, 355–63, with its curious appeals to Scripture and St. Augustine, is usually assigned to Hus. It is really by John of Jesenic.

[3] *Doc.*, 282.

[4] *Doc.*, 181. Andrew of Brod, the friend in question, at a later date became one of his chief opponents. See *Doc.*, 182.

At length the prudence of Wenzel was overcome. On Jan. 18, 1409, he issued the desired decree. The consequences are well known. After a short struggle the 'three nations,'—variously computed at all figures up to 44,000; in reality, under 1000,—'according to their oath, quitted the city, some on foot, others on horseback and waggons,' and founded the University of Leipzig. But a scanty remnant of about 500 Czechs were left behind in Prague. The victory was ascribed to Hus; he was at once appointed rector of the mutilated Czech University. 'Praise God,' he said, in one of his public sermons, 'we have excluded the Germans.'[1] In reality, it was one of the most fatal moves Hus ever made. Hitherto he had been the head of a national movement. The

[1] For this whole matter of the University, see *Doc.*, 177–8, 281–2, 347–63, 732. For the German oath, *Doc.*, 352, cf. 178, 282. Cf. also Berger, *J.H. and Sigismund*, 54 ff.; Pal. *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 221–38; Höfler, *Abzug*, 230–33. According to Sagan, 87, preaching in German was at this time forbidden. But accuracy in dates is not Sagan's strong point. For the political bearings (Höfler, 203–16), note that Wenzel's decree of neutrality (*Doc.*, 348–50) was issued Jan. 22, or four days after the Germans had been rendered powerless. So Wenzel's answer to the appeal of the Germans on Feb. 6 (*Doc.*, 350) was a promise to send legates to Pisa (Feb. 16, 1409, *Doc.*, 364). For the numbers, Creighton, ii. 8; Wylie, iii. 451, cf. Vol. i. p. 297; Rashdall, ii. 226 n., 254 n., and, above all, the new authority cited in the "Authorities" on p. 116, which settles the question.

sympathies of many were estranged, their pockets injured, by the withdrawal of the Germans. Hus had destroyed that Teutonic opposition in the University which, so long as it continued, made the Czechs a nation united by hatred. Henceforth they had leisure to become divided among themselves (*infra*), while this violent step told heavily against Hus in later years. The expelled Germans spread abroad the tale that they had quitted Prague for fear of being infected with the heresies of Wyclif. The matter was not forgotten when the opportunity came, first at Constance, then in the later crusades against the Bohemian heretics.[1]

II

The quarrel in the University was followed by the renewed outbreak of religious strife. Hus was driven, in spite of himself, to place himself at the head of the Bohemian Lollards, though he probably still deceived himself by imagining that they were but Czech Realists. At one time it would seem he had shrunk back from Wyclif's theological teaching, though welcoming his philosophical positions. 'Oh, Wyclif, Wyclif,' he had cried in a Czech sermon, 'how you will make

[1] *Doc.*, 183, 197, 281, 353; Niem, *Vita Johannis* (Hardt, ii. 453).

our heads to waggle' (*zwikles*).[1] His dread was fast disappearing. From 1409 onwards the writings of Hus contain little that is original; their line of argument is almost wholly borrowed from Wyclif, while entire passages, mistakes and all, are transferred, without acknowledgment or alteration, from the works of the Master.[2] 'As for myself,' said Hus, in the spring of 1409, in an address before the University,

'I confess before you here that I have read and studied the works of the Master, John Wyclif, and I have learnt from them much that is good. Truly, not everything which I have found in this or the other doctor is on that account of the same weight with me as the gospel: for only to Holy Scripture will I give such obedience. But why should we not read Wyclif's books also, in which are written down countless sacred truths?'[3]

We see the gradual change in the opinions of Hus most clearly in the story of his relations with Archbishop Zbinek. At one time he enjoyed

[1] *Doc.*, 168. An untranslatable pun. Cf. Dolein, *Antihussus*, 380: 'Tu vero homo olim unanimis qui simul mecum dulces capiebas cibos.' *Ep. Hussitas*, 528. The early antagonism of Hus to Wyclif is greatly exaggerated in later chronicles, and has been copied from them into Lenfant, Neander, and others. The evidence is valueless.

[2] See *infra*, p. 176.

[3] Höfler, *Geschichtsschreiber*, ii. 112–28. It was about this time that he must have translated Wyclif's *Trialogus* for the Margrave Jobst of Moravia (d. Jan. 18, 1411). See Dolein, *Ep. ad Hussitas*, 527.

the complete confidence of the archbishop. A letter of Hus is still extant in which Hus reminds Zbinek that 'at the beginning of his rule' (Oct. 1403) he had requested Hus to bring before him, 'either personally or by letter,' all cases of ecclesiastical abuse which he might espy.[1] In 1405 Zbinek showed his confidence by appointing Hus the preacher before the Synod, together with Stanislas of Znaim, at that time a member of the same party. In his two sermons on the occasion Hus confined himself to the stock theme of the vices of the clergy, sheltering himself, as was usual in such discourses, behind the authority of St. Bernard. The sermons show no sign of revolt, though the eloquence with which the preacher contrasted the lives of the clergy with the life of Christ would not be pleasing to some of his hearers:

'All ye who pass by, stop and see if any sorrow is like My sorrow. I cry aloud in rags: my priests are clothed in scarlet. I agonise with bloody sweat: they delight in luxurious baths. I pass the night spit upon and mocked: they in feasts and drunkenness. I groan upon the Cross: they snore on softest down.'[2]

In the same year Zbinek appointed Hus on a commission to investigate certain frauds carried

[1] *Doc.*, 3. Written in July 1408.
[2] *Mon.*, ii. 25–31. See espec. 26*b*, 29*b*.

on at Wilsnack, a village of Brandenburg, in connection with a relic of the blood of Christ.[1] In 1407 Zbinek again gave proof of his friendship by once more appointing Hus the special preacher before the Synod.[2]

The favour of Zbinek is proof that before 1408 Hus had taken no pronounced part in the spread of Wyclif's theological doctrines. The Reformer was, in fact, still unconscious whither he was drifting.[3] We see this continued unconsciousness in the trial of certain masters of Prague before the archbishop. One of these, Nicholas of Welemowitz, a preacher in the Church of the Holy Ghost at Prague, had asserted the Lollard idea that 'laymen as well as priests should be allowed to preach,'[4] and at his trial refused to take any oath 'save by the living God.' Hus, who calls these charges the 'errors of the Waldenses,' was present in court, and openly defended Nicholas in the matter of the oath by quotations from

[1] *Doc.*, 332. See the report of Hus, *Mon.*, i. 154–62, which may well be compared with a similar sermon by Grosseteste, of which Hus shows no knowledge (in *Hist. Mag.*, iv. 643 ; vi. 138–144). His knowledge of Grosseteste was, in fact, only second-hand from Wyclif. For the miracle, see Neander, x. 342–5.

[2] Sermon in *Mon.*, ii. 32–36 ; cf. Neander, x. 359–60. For the official thanks, *Doc.*, 167. Zbinek was present.

[3] Cf. *Doc.*, 5, last par.

[4] So also Jerome. Hardt, iv. 673.

Chrysostom. He further remonstrated with the archbishop by letter, complaining with warmth that incestuous and criminal clerks escape without correction, while humble priests, offering themselves for the work of preaching, are thrown into prison and suffer exile as if they were heretics.'[1] In reality the trials were not serious; even Abraham was released. For Wenzel was anxious to further his political projects by obtaining a clean bill, if we may so put it, for the character of his subjects. Accordingly, Zbinek, a few days after the release of Abraham, declared, in a Synod at Prague (July 17), 'that after making diligent inquisition he could find no heretic in Bohemia.'[2]

Such a declaration, made to order, settled nothing. A few weeks after it was given, we find the clergy flying at higher game. They accused Hus before the archbishop of preaching, 'in the presence of a vast multitude of both sexes,' 'scandalous sermons which made clerks hateful to the people.' He had gone so far, they said, as to 'deal with the matter not in

[1] *Doc.*, 3, 184–5, 342–3, 392; cf. *Mon.*, i. 332*b*. May and June 1408. Two others, Sigismund of Jistebnitz and Matthias Pater of Knin, were tried with Abraham. The last was charged with Wyclif's doctrine of the Sacrament. He recanted, and shortly afterwards died (*Doc.*, 338–40, 730–1).

[2] *Doc.*, 161, 392. Abraham was released July 1 (*Doc.*, 343).

general terms, but by descending to particulars.'[1] They further raked up an incident, of which Hus was destined to hear much for the rest of his life: that in the presence of Zbinek he had said 'he wished his soul might be where rests the soul of Wyclif.'[2] That Hus still felt confident of his position is evident not only from the reply he made to this last charge, but in the contemptuous and hair-splitting quibbles with which he overwhelmed his accusers. Zbinek, in fact, was powerless. Hus reminded him of his recent declaration 'that he could find no heretic in Bohemia.' The opponents of Hus were caught 'in a trap of their own making.'[3]

[1] July 17, 1407, and June 16, 1408 (*Doc.*, 154–5). Note the curious entry: 'Quamquam synodaliter omnibus prohibitum sit praedicare excessive (!) contra clerum de anno praesenti.' By 'excessive preaching' would be meant the statement of Hus 'that it would be easier to find a stag with golden antlers on the bridge of Prague than a worthy priest.' He corrects this in *Doc.*, 158.

[2] A part of the charge was that Hus said: 'Wyclif is a catholic doctor.' Hus denied, and pleaded that he scarcely knew how to express catholic in Czech (*Doc.*, 167).

[3] For this incident, *Doc.*, 153–65. Date uncertain, but between the Synod and the outbreak of the Univ. matter (June–December 1408). (See *Doc.*, 164.) For a further and more measured reply of Hus to this and other charges, see *Doc.*, 164–9, not written until 1414. Another reply was written about this time, *De Arguendo Clero pro Concione* (*Mon.*, i. 149–53. Partly analysed, Neander, x. 371–2). It is a thoroughly

About this time an incident occurred which could not fail to give greater boldness to the Wyclifists. Indirectly, perhaps, the help it gave them was the cause of the attack upon Hus. Two Czech students, Nicholas Faulfiss[1] and George of Knyehnicz, brought back from Oxford a document sealed with the seal of the University. This purported to be a testimonial by the great University to the orthodoxy of the heresiarch. Hus, we are told, read this paper to the people in a sermon, and showed them the seal. The document in question was probably a forgery, though the seal was genuine. But the silence of his enemies on the matter at the time shows its general acceptance, or at anyrate the uncertainty of its opponents. Not until the coming of the Englishman Stokes, in 1411 (*infra*), did the Nominalists discover that this effective weapon of the Wyclifists[2] had not been fairly obtained.[3]

academical performance, in which I can detect no marks of time. The famous wish of Hus *re* Wyclif was never forgiven or forgotten. It crops up to the end, *Doc.*, 154, 161, 168; *Mon.*, i. 108*b*. Hus (*Doc.*, 161) interprets it by the "larger hope."

[1] For Faulfiss, see Vol. i. p. 241; Wyclif, *De Civ. Dom.*, p. xvii; *Doc.*, 730; Æn. Sylv. *Hist. Boh.*, c. 35, with Loserth's comments, *W.H.* 72.

[2] Loserth has shown (82–86) that Wyclifist was the usual designation, Hussite not being in common use until 1420.

[3] On this forged testimonial, see Vol. i. 241–2; cf. Neander,

The growing coolness between Hus and Zbinek soon issued in a complete breach. In December 1408 there came the great struggle over the University, in one of the many tangles of which Zbinek was involved. The archbishop was a strong adherent of Gregory XII. Wenzel, as we have seen, had decided to espouse the cause of the Pisan cardinals, who on their part agreed to recognise his claims as king of the Romans.[1] Hus, to further his pet project of Czech ascendency in the University, had embraced the same side, and advocated, in a somewhat ingenuous and academic way, the method of neutrality. Zbinek retorted by inhibiting, 'in letters fixed to the doors of the churches,' Hus and 'all masters who sided with the sacred college' from all priestly functions. To this command Hus paid no heed, though in his letters he still made fervid professions of obedience.[2] His real contempt was better ex-

ix. 351; and on the other side, Lechler, 456. For the Latin original, see *Mon.*, ii. 366*b*. Lewis, *Life and Sufferings of J. W.*, 305, 306, or Wilkins, iii. 302. For references by Hus, see *Mon.*, i. 109; *Doc.*, 313, 232. From Hardt, iv. 645, we learn that 'a youth handed it to Jerome to publish, which he did.'

[1] *Doc.*, 364–71 (Feb. 16 and March 15, 1409). See also Höfler, *Abzug*, 203–16.

[2] *Doc.*, 6, 21, 166.

pressed in a sermon which at this time he preached in the Bethlehem. 'I saw,' he tells us,

'a monk sitting before me during the sermon with head bowed, face hidden in his grey cloak. I knew, from certain warnings received, that he had come to act the spy. So I called out, after expounding the nature of good wheat and straw: "Man in the cowl, write that down in your notebook and take it to the archbishop"' (*Doc.*, 176).

Zbinek was powerless. His German allies, who also were against neutrality and in favour of Rupert rather than Wenzel, were driven out of the University. The Czech Realists and Pisans triumphed. 'Immediately after,' we read, 'Wiclify began to grow strong, and Hus and his adherents renounced their spiritual obedience under the favour of the laity.' All that Zbinek could do was to persuade the Bohemian nation in the University to severely restrict the right of lecturing on Wyclif, or defending his propositions.[1] The Wyclifists retorted—Hus himself did not join them—by procuring the citation of the archbishop before the Pisan Curia.[2]

[1] *Doc.*, 197.

[2] *Doc.*, 733; cf. *ibid.* 379, 381. The date (Dec. 8) is either an error—for Zbinek had made his peace on Sept. 2 (*Doc.*, 372–3, 733)—or denotes date of official cognisance of the citation by the Curia. Alexander's Bull [*Doc.*, 374–6; cf. *ibid.* 189, 724 (10)] makes no mention of the citation. In the citation we may suspect royal influence.

Zbinek deemed it well to abandon Gregory and make his peace with Alexander V. At the same time he accused the Wyclifists of being the source of all the mischief. He had his reward. Alexander (Dec. 20) quashed the citation, and conferred upon Zbinek a commission to take strong steps against the heretics, forbidding also all preaching 'in chapels, even those which had privileges granted by the Apostolic See.'[1] All books of Wyclif were ordered to be delivered up to the archbishop, 'that they might be removed from the eyes of the faithful.'[2]

On the publication of this Bull in Prague,[3] Hus and others handed over to the archbishop certain works of Wyclif: 'When,' they added, 'you have found any errors in them, be pleased to point them out to us, and we shall be glad to denounce them publicly.'[4] Zbinek's sole reply was an order that seventeen books of Wyclif, whose names are given, should be burnt, 'the remaining books of the said John, heresiarch,

[1] On May 15, 1408, Gregory XII. had given the Bethlehem all the rights of a parish church, *Doc.*, 340–1, much to the disgust of the German vicars in Prague.

[2] *Doc.*, 200–1; Mansi, xxvii. 305. For this conflict between Zbinek, who was chancellor of the University as well as archbishop, see Höfler, *Abzug*, 167–202.

[3] *Doc.*, 733, March 9, 1410. [4] *Doc.*, 280.

to await' fuller examination. Notice of this decision was served upon Hus.[1]

Against this attack on its privileges the University at once protested.[2] Hus, who especially resented the prohibition of further preaching in the chapels, including the Bethlehem, appealed 'to Alexander himself that he might be better informed.'[3] On his decease, Hus further appealed to John XXIII., urging that with the death of Alexander the commission had become null and void.[4] They had obtained, they pleaded, the books of Wyclif 'at great trouble and cost.' Only a fool 'would condemn to be burnt treatises—logical, philosophical, mathematical,

[1] June 16. *Doc.*, 378–85, cf. 201. Note the *De Ecclesia* is not among them (*Doc.*, 380). This treatise had, however, been copied by Faulfiss at Oxford in 1407 (*De Eccles.*, xxxi.), and another copy, belonging to Peter Zepekow, is now at Prague. Zepekow is one of the students who, with Hus, resisted this burning and appealed to the Pope (*Doc.*, 387). The fact that several of the works of Wyclif mentioned are merely philosophical, shows Nominalist influence still at work.

[2] June 21. *Doc.*, 386, from which we also learn that a preliminary meeting of protest had been held on June 15 ('at five p.m.,' *Doc.*, 374), not June 14, as *Doc.*, 393 (unless, indeed, the ecclesiastical method of reckoning time and days accounts for the confusion).

[3] *Mon.*, i. 235*b*, 312*b*.

[4] *Doc.* 387–96; cf. 189, dated June 25. Three of the signatories had taken part in the previous appeal. See *supra*, p. 137.

moral—which contain many noble truths, but no errors. By the same reasoning we must burn the books of Aristotle, the commentaries of Averrhoes, or the works of Origen.'[1] They further protested against the charge that Bohemia was full of heretics, quoting against Zbinek his own declaration. The prohibition of preaching at the Bethlehem and elsewhere was an infringement of the direct command of Jesus. 'Unless,' they concluded, 'the seed of the Word and of preaching be left unto us, we shall become as Sodom and Gomorrha.'

Before the appeal could be considered, Zbinek brought matters to a head by burning two hundred manuscripts of Wyclif's works in the courtyard of his palace on the Hradschin, 'in the presence of a number of prelates and clergy, who chanted the Te Deum with a loud voice,' while the bells were tolled as if for the dead. 'The better copies,' some of them bound with gold knobs, 'were, however, it is believed, kept over.'[2] Two days later, Zbinek, amid the angry cries of the people, excommunicated Hus[3] and others

[1] Cf. Prokop of Pilsen, in Loserth, *W.H.*, 321.

[2] *Doc.*, 734. On the contrary, *Æn. Sylv.*, 104. See also, on the whole matter, Hus's sermon for the 6th Sunday after Epiphany (Nowotny, i. 42–51), a sermon of great interest, and Dolein, *Antihussus*, 384–6.

[3] *Doc.*, 397–9, July 18, 1410.

for not yet delivering up their copies. Wenzel retorted by ordering the archbishop to refund their value to the owners of the burnt volumes, and, on his refusal, seized his revenues. The mob also took matters into their own hand. On July 22 they burst into the cathedral and drove forty priests from the altars. 'On the same day, in the Church of St. Stephen's in the New Town, six men with drawn swords tried to slay a blaspheming preacher. The terror overwhelmed all vicars.' As for the burnt books, the Wyclifists set to work 'to collect new copies from every quarter.'[1]

The excitement in Prague was intense, nor was it lessened by an incautious sermon of Hus, preached before an immense congregation. 'Behold,' cried the angry orator,

'the Pope who has just died,' meaning Alexander v. of blessed memory, 'wrote that there are many men among us whose hearts are infected with heresy.' At these words all the people cried out: 'He lies! He lies!' Thereupon John Hus added: 'Herein is fulfilled the prophecy which James of Taramo wrote, that in the year 1409 one would arise who should persecute the faith and gospel of Christ; inasmuch as the late Pope—I know not whether he is in heaven or hell—ordered on his asses's skins that the archbishop should burn the books of Wyclif. Behold, I have appealed against the decree of the archbishop! Will you stand by me?' Where-

[1] *Doc.*, 734; Dol. *Antihussus*, 386.

upon the people replied: 'We do, and we will.' 'It is time, then,' replied Hus, 'that he who will defend the law of God should gird himself with the sword.'[1]

This account is probably exaggerated. Nevertheless we are not surprised that Stephen Dolein should call the Bethlehem 'an insidious den of Wyclifists,' and should plead 'for the removal of this conventicle and Satanic school of that heretic Wyclif.' 'Sancta Maria,' he continues, 'and all Saints, pray for us that truth may conquer; and thou, muck-sack (sacce) Wyclif, pray for thine that falsehood may be condemned.'[2]

A few days later Hus proclaimed 'that on the next Lord's day (July 27) he would defend Wyclif's treatise *Concerning the Trinity*,' while other Wyclifists in the University would take up other works.[3] The oration of Hus, in addition to a declaration of willingness to obtain the martyr's crown,[4] contains his oft-cited statement, that 'from the beginning of his studies he had made it a rule, whenever he found a better

[1] Abridged from the report of Oddo Colonna, *Doc.*, 405; cf. 171, where Hus denied that the people said 'he lies,' *i.e.* Alexander, but 'they lie,' *i.e.* the prelates.

[2] Dol., *Antihussus*, 373, 426; cf. 190, 267.

[3] *Doc.*, 399-400.

[4] We may own, with Palacky, that Hus is a little too prone to talk about martyrdom. Cf. *Mon.*, 106*a*; *Doc.*, 31, 43, 55; and Dolein's rebuke, *Antihussus*, 383.

opinion upon any matter, gladly and without a struggle to give up the old one, being well aware that what we know is vastly less than what we do not know, as Themistius says.'[1] With this admirable sentiment — taken word for word, 'Themistius' and all, without acknowledgment, from Wyclif's *De Universalibus*—we may compare Hus's later statement in his *De Ecclesia*: 'Often have I allowed myself to be set right even by one of my own scholars, when I saw that the reasons were good, thanking them also for the correction.'[2] As for the burning, 'I call it,' said Hus, 'a poor business. Such bonfires never yet removed a single sin from the hearts of men.' 'O that these bagatelles chattering in a corner, crickets chirping in the cracks, would sometimes read the gospel of Christ and find out how often our Saviour disputed with Pharisees' (*Mon.*, i. 107).

More originality was displayed in the address of Simon of Tissnow.[3] 'Tell me,' cried the orator,

[1] *Mon.*, 105*a*. [2] *Mon.*, i. 247.

[3] July 29. For the oration of Hus, see *Mon.*, i. 105–7. The text, in part, of the other defences is in Loserth, 309–336. Simon of Tissnow is well worth reading. Zdislaw of Wartenberk or Zwierzeticz had been in England, and knew Oxford (*infra*, p. 149, and Loserth, 329). For his relation to Hus, see Höfler, *Gesch.*, ii. 96. In Hardt, iv. 642, he saves Jerome, in the riots, from killing Friar Benesch. See *supra*, p. 141.

'you poor, innocent, little tractate, what evil have you done to your judges and preachers? Perchance you have rebuked their pride and ambition?' 'Ah, no!' answers the tractate, 'that is not my business; that belongs to my companion in suffering, *De civili dominio*.' 'Well, then, have you evoked the unfathomable avarice of the priests?' 'Ah, no! that was done by the *Sermons on the Gospels for the Church Year*, now condemned with me.' 'Perchance you have said hard things on the detestable heresy of simony?' 'Not I; that was done by my fellow-prisoner, *De Simonia*.' 'Now, you commended their evangelical purity, so displeasing to the prelates?' 'No; that was done by the *Dialogue* and *Trialogue*.' 'I fear, then, my little tractate, that you have been accusing the ignorance and laziness of the clergy?' 'Dear defender, weary me not with further questions. I will confess crime. I am put into the hands of innocent youths that by my help they may learn logic.'

'What shall I say,' continued the orator, 'concerning the right reverend Zbinek. His ignorance excuses him. Spare him and pray for him.' The contempt of the scholar for the archbishop was shared by the people. In satirical skits, which Wenzel found it needful to forbid, they sung in the streets—

'Bishop Zbinek has still to learn his A B C,
He has burnt books without knowing what was in them.'[1]

Among the orators in defence of Wyclif

[1] Dolein, *Antihussus*, 417–8; Loserth, 307, 314; *Doc.*, 189, 333, 487. For other skits, see Höfler, *Ges.*, i. 541–64. Jerome was one of the leaders in teaching these songs 'which working men have learned,' as also songs 'in quibus Bibliæ expressit.'

certain names are conspicuously absent. We look in vain for Andrew of Brod, Stanislas of Znaim, or Stephen Palecz. These men, formerly allies of Hus, were already drifting into his most determined opponents. But we must beware of doing them an injustice. The drift was not only on one side. If Hus tardily woke up to discover how much he sympathised with Wyclif, we need not be surprised if others should tardily discover their real antagonism. The point at issue was at first confused. 'Once,' said Hus, 'ye were Realists,' and as Realists they had flung themselves into the battle. Stanislas of Znaim, one of the teachers of Hus,[1] was, in fact, at one time the leader of the whole movement. In a squib of the times we read :

> 'Wyclif, the son of the Devil, begat Stanislas of Znaim, who begat
> Peter of Znaim, and Peter of Znaim begat
> Stephen Palecz, and Stephen Palecz begat Hus.'[2]

In the controversy on the forty articles (1403) Stanislas had defended incriminated doctrines with warmth,—'Let him who likes rise up and attack, I am willing to defend.' He spoke so

[1] 'A quo in actis scholasticis multa bona didici' (*Mon.*, i. 265*a*).

[2] *Mon.*, i. 255*b*. Cf. the full form in Loserth, 350.

haughtily that 'some of the senior doctors left the congregation.'[1] Shortly afterwards he published a tractate, *De Remanentia Panis*, 'argued boldly in the schools' on the side of Wyclif, and 'asked Hus if he would hold firmly with him.'[2] Stanislas' tractate was pronounced heretical by the Saxon Master, Ludolph Meistermann,[3] and he was 'forced to recant.' With Stanislas, though less prominent and pronounced, Stephen Palecz was closely associated.

The immediate cause of their 'backsliding like a crab,'[4] as Hus termed it, is somewhat obscure. In the autumn of 1408, in furtherance of Wenzel's policy, an embassy was despatched to the Pisan cardinals. It consisted, among others, of John Cardinalis of Reinstein, Stanislas of Znaim, and Stephen Palecz. The two last, for some reason or other,—perhaps because of their well-known sympathy with the Wyclifists, — incurred the suspicion of Cossa. They were arrested at Bologna, 'deprived of their goods, and imprisoned.' Only on the petition of the University, and of the cardinals

[1] *Mon.*, i. 260*a*, 265*b*.

[2] *Doc.*, 56, 499. Two years later he abjured it.

[3] 'Rudolphus Magistermon,' *Mon.*, i. 255*b*. But see Loserth, 98 n. 2.

[4] 'Conversus es ad signa vel terminos retrocedens sicut cancer' (*Mon.*, i. 262*a*).

themselves, were the two deputies released.[1] They returned to Prague, to find the University wrecked by the disruption. Whether this last event, or some subtle influences brought to bear upon them in their imprisonment, or the greater conservatism of maturer years, led to a change of view we know not. Certain it is that they slowly drifted from alliance with Hus into the bitterest opposition. They first became what Hus called 'Terminists,' *i.e.* Nominalists, then, by a natural sequence, the persecutors of their old associates.[2]

In the September of 1410 Hus, 'a brother beloved in Christ, though unknown to me by face,' received an interesting letter from an English Lollard, one Richard Wyche, vicar of Deptford, a living which he had received in 1402 on his recantation at Bishop's Auckland. As this letter shows, his recantation was not very genuine: Wyche rejoices that he has heard the

[1] *Mon.*, i. 256*a*. Wenzel's letter (Nov. 24, 1408, 'Wratislaviæ,' *i.e.* Breslau), *Doc.*, 343. University's petition (Dec. 8), *Doc.*, 345-6. The letter of the cardinals (Feb. 12, 1409), *Doc.*, 363. See also *Doc.*, 731, where it is said 'Hus, Jesenic, and Christan procured their release.' According to Hus (*Doc.*, 716), Palecz was robbed of '207 gold knights,'—a slang name for a coin.

[2] *Mon.*, i. 260*a*. Hus attributes the commencement of change to the imprisonment (*Mon.*, i. 288*a*, 289*a*; *Doc.*, 56).

news that Hus is now walking in the light. He eloquently exhorts him to endurance. He salutes 'all the believers and faithful disciples of the truth, in especial Jacobell'[1] of Mies. This letter Hus publicly read in a sermon before a congregation which he 'reckoned at near ten thousand people.'

'Lo, our dearest brother and fellow-soldier Richard, the companion of Wyclif in the toils of the Gospel, has written you a letter of such power that for my part, if I possessed no other writing, I would gladly lay down my life for the gospel of Christ. Of a truth, with the Lord's help, I will do so yet.'

'Dear brother,' he replied,

'The people will hear nothing but the Scriptures, especially the gospels and epistles. And wherever, in town, village, house, or castle, a preacher of the sacred truth appears, there the people flock together in crowds. . . . Lo, I have but touched the tail of Antichrist, and it has opened its mouth, that it may swallow me up with my brothers. . . . Our lord the king and his whole court, queen, barons, and common people, are all for the word of Jesus Christ. The Church of Christ in Bohemia salutes the Church of Christ in England.'[2]

---

[1] Jakoubek. So called because of his little stature.

[2] For Richard Wyche, see Vol. i. pp. 284, 309. For his letter, dated London, Sept. 8, 1410, see *Mon.*, i. 101. He signs himself, perhaps as a disguise, 'Ricus Wychewitz,' a signature which has mislead most historians. For the reply of Hus, see *Doc.*, 12–14. Hus tells us that his congregation 'requested him to translate into it Czech.' A copy of the translation exists.

By the same messenger Woksa of Waldstein, a councillor of Prague and a favourite at court, and Zdislaw of Zwierzeticz,—one of the disputants in the recent tournament,—received letters from Oldcastle. The lord of Cobham thanked God for having put it into their hearts to defend His law. Let them stand staunch for the truth, even unto death.[1]

As this letter shows, Hus had found powerful adherents at court. He soon needed their help. On August 25 Oddo Colonna, the future Martin v., to whom John had handed over the appeal of Hus, decided against him, and urged the archbishop to proceed against the Wyclifists with all severity, 'calling in, if need be, the help of the secular arm.'[2] A vigorous protest was at once made by Wenzel and Queen Sophie, by certain barons of the realm, and by the magistrates of Prague, whose rights in the Bethlehem Chapel were at stake. 'You ought to know,' wrote the queen to the cardinals, 'that the Word of God cannot be bound, but must be preached in byways, market-places, buildings; in a word,

[1] For Woksa, see *infra*, p. 168. For this letter, Wylie, iii. 462; *Academy*, 26th October 1889, p. 270, for a translation.

[2] *Doc.*, 190, 401–8. Carried out by Zbinek, Sept. 24 (*Doc.*, 202).

anywhere according to the needs of the hearers.'[1] Colonna replied by citing Hus to Bologna, where the Curia was then resident.[2] Once more Wenzel and Sophie protested.[3] They requested John to release Hus, 'our faithful and beloved chaplain,' from the journey, 'on account of the perils of the road, and the danger from Hus's enemies.' The case, they pleaded, should be tried before the University of Prague. But the influence or gifts[4] of Zbinek prevailed. While the appeal of the King to the Pope

[1] *Doc.*, 413. See, further, *Doc.*, 409–15, Sept. 12 and 16.

[2] Berger, *Sig.*, 70, says Sept. 20; *Doc.*, 734 gives Oct. 1, with which *Doc.*, 202 would better agree. It was at anyrate after Sept. 24. The process against Hus is very confused, and needs elucidation. According to *Doc.*, 189 (followed by Loserth, 128), John first handed over the case to four cardinals, who called together all the doctors of theology then in Bologna, and laid before them Wyclif's works. They decided that the books of Wyclif ought not to have been burnt by Zbinek. Creighton, ii. 13, puts the four cardinals as a new commission after Colonna, allowed for political purposes to procrastinate. As regards the doctors of Bologna, the better account is given *Doc.*, 427, where the date assigned is Aug. 1410. They met at Colonna's house; conclusion as above. In the absence of further knowledge, we suspect political wheels within wheels.

[3] *Doc.*, 422–5, cf. 190. Sept. 30–Oct. 2. Compare also Dolein, *Auca et Passer*, 464–6, why Hus (*auca*, goose) did not obey the citation; and cf. Nowotny, *op. cit.* ii. 71. In *Doc.*, 466, cf. 19, 24, Hus pleaded the imprisonment of Stanislas and Palecz.

[4] 'Quam illi magno emerunt,' *Doc.*, 24.

was still undecided, Colonna placed Hus under excommunication.[1] On March 15 the excommunication was read in all the churches of Prague, with two exceptions.[2] Hus met it with defiance. 'In this I rejoice,' he wrote to his friends, 'that for the sake of the gospel I am excommunicated, like a wicked and disobedient man. I have preferred rather to obey God by preaching, than to obey Pope, archbishop, and satraps of that ilk, when they disobey the command of Christ. I have signed my name to the letter, that you may know how to meet the hounds of the devil.'[3]

Of his appeal and its delays Hus has given us a version, partly, no doubt, hearsay, but too characteristic of the age to be disputed. Following custom, Hus had despatched his proctors to Rome. When they arrived, they could obtain no hearing, though it should have been given 'to pagan, Jew, heretic, and the devil himself if he had come with the request.' The cardinals of the first commission

'obtained beautiful horses, silver cups, and precious rings from his adversaries. Then the Pope transferred the matter to

---

[1] Feb. 1411. *Doc.*, 202. Cf. *Doc.*, 16–18, 192.

[2] *Doc.*, 735. One of them, St. Michael's in the old town, was under Christan Prachaticz.

[3] May 25. *Doc.*, 16–18.

others, and the same thing happened again. Of the latter commission, some are dead, some in the prisons of Ladislaus. Then the Pope himself took up the matter, saying that he wished to decide it himself. "All men," he added, "have got something from the case, but I have nothing." But when my advocates pleaded for a hearing, he refused, and asked for "yellow knights," of which Goose had had none, nor would he have given them if he had possessed them. So the Pope, wanting to get these "knights," ordered my proctors to be thrown into prison.'[1]

Truly, as Hus remarks, 'the Roman Curia does not take the lamb without the wool.'[2]

Meanwhile in Bohemia the excitement was intense, as Hus owns—'riots, hatreds, and murders.' A Polish cutler in Prague, who incautiously reviled Wyclif, was openly cudgelled.[3] As Prague still persisted in its writ of sequestration against the property of Zbinek for the burning of the books, the archbishop retorted by an interdict on the city and surrounding country.[4] Prague treated the matter with indifference. The goods of the priests who obeyed were seized; they themselves—'nudi cum mulieribus ducti'—cast into prison or banished.

[1] *Doc.*, 726; cf. *Mon.*, i. 235*b*, 332, and *Doc.*, 191.

[2] *Mon.*, i. 256*a*.

[3] Mobs were the same then as now. We read of 'peponibus (cabbages), lapidibus impositis, ac putridis ovis' (Hardt, iv. 666); and compare *Doc.*, 415, for the riot.

[4] May 2, 1411, *Doc.*, 429–32. On page 430 an interesting list of Hussite ringleaders, many of them shopkeepers.

Nobles, burghers, and king joined hands in the spoliation of the Church. On the pillage of his treasury (May 6) the archbishop fled.[1]

But Wenzel and Zbinek were anxious for peace. Both realised that they had gone too far. Wenzel perceived that the struggle over religion was an injury to his political projects: Pope John, on his part, was willing to throw over Zbinek if he could win over to his side Sigismund, who still adhered to Gregory, or save Wenzel from defection. So in June 1411 Stephen Palecz conveniently showed cause why the interdict should be removed. On July 3 the case between the University and the archbishop was placed in the hands of a court of arbitration, chiefly laymen of the highest rank. They decided, three days later, that Zbinek should despatch to the Pope an assurance that there were no heretics in Bohemia, and obtain the removal of all excommunications. The King, on his part, must restore the archbishop's property and release the imprisoned clergy. Hus furthered the peace by reading before the University, on September 1, a letter to John, in which he

[1] *Doc.*, 283, 735–6. *Mon.*, i. 106*a*. For a sermon which Hus preached (June 1411) justifying Wenzel, see *Mon.*, ii. 47–9. This extreme utterance is largely from Wyclif's *De Officio Regis*, to which, for once, Hus owns his indebtedness.

declared that he had never forsaken the doctrines of the Church. If any error be found against him, he is willing 'to be corrected by fire unless he would yield.' Hus further wrote a letter to the cardinals in the same tenor. He prays the cardinals, 'who are elevated to power to snatch souls from the jaws of Satan, and to succour those who are oppressed in the name of Christ, . . . to dispense him from the burden of appearing in person.' He slily hints that the origin of his troubles is his adhesion to the Pisan Council. He protested, 'Jesus Christ being his witness, that he is innocent of the things of which his enemies accuse him.' The draft of Zbinek's letter still exists. It states that 'after making diligent inqusition, I can discover no heresies in Bohemia. The dispute between Hus, the University, and myself has been settled.' This letter was never sent. Fresh disputes broke out, which led Zbinek to appeal to Sigismund (Sept. 5). On his way to the court of this king he suddenly died, at Pressburg (Sept. 28, 1411).[1] He was a

[1] *Doc.*, 432–40, 18–21, 193, 271–2, 441–6. Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 265–9 ; Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 287–311. According to Dolein, *Antihussus*, 419, the Hussites represented Zbinek's death as a judgment. Hus (*Doc.*, 724) tells us there were twenty-four competitors for his vacant post. For Zbinek's character, see *Doc.*, 733.

weak, well-meaning man, alternating excessive obstinacy with indecision. He was succeeded by an old man even weaker than himself, Wenzel's physician, Albik (Oct. 29, 1411). His reign was not long. He soon exchanged his difficult post with his suffragan, the Bishop of Olmütz, and retired to a less thorny benefice.

III

The death of Zbinek was not the end of the strife. In September of the same year there arrived in Prague a deputation from Henry IV. of England, returning from a mission to Sigismund. One of the party was a certain John Stokes. This man, licentiate of laws of Cambridge, former principal of St. Edmund's Hall, was now beginning a diplomatic career, which continued until late in the reign of Henry VI. For his services to the Crown he was abundantly rewarded with prebends at York, Lincoln, Hereford, and London, and an archdeaconry of Ely. He died in 1466. This Stokes must not be confounded by the reader with Peter Stokes, a Carmelite friar, who had taken a leading part against the Lollards in the Oxford disturbances of 1382, and who had fled from the pulpit in fear of his life as precipitately

as Dominie Samson, and ridden from Oxford to London in a single day.

On hearing of the arrival of these English masters, the rector of the University invited them to a banquet. The invitation was declined, 'at the instigation of a certain knight,' probably Hartung von Clux,[1] the head of the mission. When further approached, Stokes gave his reasons: 'Whosoever reads Wyclif's books, or makes them his study, must of necessity, however good his intentions, in the course of time lapse into heresy.' He added, at Constance, that there had fallen into his hands in Prague a Lollard tract on the Sacrament which he was told, wrongly he owned, was the work of Hus.[2]

For this insult to his University Hus posted a challenge on the cathedral door, inviting Stokes to a discussion at six o'clock on the evening of Sunday, September 13. Stokes declined the encounter diplomatically, pleading the king's business. He was ready, however, to take up the challenge 'at Paris, before the Roman Curia, or before any other neutral University approved of

[1] Clux was a Silesian in the service of Henry. See Caro, *Das Bündniss von Canterbury*, 12 n.; Lenz, *Sig.*, 31–6; and Finke, *Con. Constanc.*, i. 91 (where he is again associated with Stokes, March 12, 1412), 373–7 and *passim*. For Stokes, see Wylie, iii. 469–70. No life of either in the *D.N.B.*

[2] *Doc.*, 277.

by both parties.' He added, in answer, it would seem, to a question put to him by some Prague masters,

> 'In England Wyclif is regarded as a heretic, and his works burnt whenever found. . . . So if I were acquainted with anyone who read or studied Wyclif's books, or who minded to receive and hold his opinions, I would at once counsel him, for the sake of God and of brotherly love, to desist, because I know the evil results of such studies.'

Stokes concludes with a characteristic piece of insular pride: 'If anyone is willing to take up this challenge, but cannot afford it, I shall be glad to contribute to his expenses.'

Not to be done out of his tournament, Hus tilted alone on the day he had named. Naturally he came off an easy winner. His defence is still extant. It is full of banter, valuable reminiscences, and doubtful history. Oxford had decided that Hus was not a heretic —the reference is to the famous forgery, of which Hus makes further mention and defence. If Wyclif was a heretic, Oxford must be full of heretics, inasmuch as 'for thirty years past the University had been reading Wyclif's works.' John of Gaunt, also the father of Henry IV., must be a heretic. Let Stokes, on his return, 'dare to assert that consequence in the presence of his king. I will not share with him

the gift he will get.' 'I do not believe,' Hus concludes,

'I will not grant, that Wyclif is a heretic; I will not affirm a negative, but I hope that he is not, since in doubtful matters one ought to choose the better part. Wherefore, I hope that Wyclif is among the saved. I am drawn to Wyclif by the reputation he has with good priests, with the University of Oxford, and with people in general; I do not say with wicked, avaricious, and luxurious prelates and priests. I am drawn to him by his writings, in which he diligently desires to bring back all men to the law of Christ, especially the clergy, that, laying aside the pomp and rule of this world, they may live, like the apostles, the life of Christ.'

Hus and Stokes were destined to meet again, at Constance.[1]

The matter of Stokes was soon forgotten in a wider issue. In the autumn of 1411 John XXIII., in the throes of his struggle with Ladislaus and Gregory, issued Bulls preaching a crusade against the king of Naples. The same indulgences were offered as for a campaign in Palestine to all those who take up arms, or who bought 'suitable men' to fight for them. As with the later Tetzel, the indulgences were no doubt duly qualified with limitations

[1] For the Stokes incident, see *Doc.*, 447–8 (with text corrected, Loserth, 135 n. 2), *Mon.*, i. 108–110. For articles of Wyclif that Hus did not at this time agree with, see his list, *Doc.*, 19. His change over some was very rapid. See *infra*, p. 164.

—'omnibus vere penitentibus et confessis.' In practice, for men do not sin in Latin, they were often regarded as the selling permission to sin, or the buying of pardon for past transgressions. In some cases ignorant and scandalous priests used the opportunity to wring out, in the confessional, money and profit for themselves, a practice which Archbishop Albik tried to check.[1] He also directed that the preaching of the gospel should not be superseded by that of the crusade.

In the May of 1412 Master Wenzel Tiem, Dean of Passau, legate and licensed agent for the dioceses of Salzburg, Magdeburg, and Bohemia, arrived in Prague, and opened his sale. Soon the traffic was in full swing, three money chests set up in the Prague churches, middlemen doing a good trade for country parishes, where payments were often made in kind. Hus, like Luther, —who himself points out the similarity of their circumstances,[2]—at once entered the lists. Like Luther, Hus scarcely recognised how old the

[1] *Doc.*, 223, cf. 451. For the Bull (Sept. 9), see *Mon.*, i. 171–2. For Tiem's authorisation (Dec. 2), *ib.* i. 172–3, and for the form of indulgence, *ib.* i. 180*b*. The burden of Hus's attack lay in the charge that John had given an indulgence 'a culpa et a pena.' This was not really in the Bull. See Lea, *Auric. Conf.*, iii. 54–80.

[2] *Mon.*, i. preface.

custom was: he looked upon it as a complete innovation, and forgot his own early experiences. 'Woe is me,' he wrote to the Lithuanian prince Ladislaus, king of Poland, 'if I hold my peace. Better to die than not to oppose such wickedness, and so become a partner in this crime and hell.'[1] He placarded church-doors with his theses, and thundered against 'Antichrist' in the Bethlehem Chapel and among 'the artists.' As 'the German vicars had received the Bull and read it aloud' in their churches, the Czechs at once rallied to the cause of Hus (*Doc.*, 736).

In his proceedings against the indulgences, Hus seems to have been more conscious than Luther was at first of his opposition to the authorities. News of the coming sale had already driven him to the bold step of answering publicly in the Bethlehem Chapel, in a legal deed drawn up by a notary,—'because people are wont to give

[1] June 10, *Doc.*, 30. This letter is an illustration how the influence of Hus was felt, as the clergy complained, 'through Bohemia, Poland, Hungary, and Moravia' (*Doc.*, 461). Ladislaus (Jagello), d. 1434, had only recently been converted (March 4, 1388). He could neither read nor write. The capital of his state was Vilna. But after his marriage (1386) to Hedwig, the heiress of Poland, and his subsequent accession to the Polish crown, he transferred his throne to Cracow. See *infra*, p. 167, and *supra*, p. 125. In 1397–1400 he founded a University at Cracow (Rashdall, ii. 284–6). The Poles at Hedwig's College at Prague would lead to Hus's knowing him or writing.

greater credence to such a document,'—three questions that had been sent to him. The third question was one of those problems in which the medieval schoolmen delighted: 'Whether any of the people of Pharaoh, drowned in the Red Sea, may have been saved?' But the other questions, and the answers of Hus, go to the root of the controversy: 'Whether a man must believe in the Pope?' and 'Whether it is possible that a man can be saved who does not really confess to a priest?'[1] We see the same spirit of conscious opposition, so different from the early movement in Germany, in the account he has given us of an interview he had with Wenzel Tiem shortly after he arrived at Prague. 'I know well,' he writes,

'the difference between the apostolic commands and the commands of the Pope. So when I was asked by the legates of John, in the presence of Archbishop Albik, "Whether I were willing to obey the apostolic commands?" I answered: "I desire with all my heart to obey the apostolic commands." Thereupon the legates, holding apostolic and papal commands to be interchangeable, thought that I was willing to preach to the

[1] March 3, 1412. *Mon.*, i. 167–9. The full bearing of this paper is seen in Dolein, *Antihussus*, 405–17, 419–23, 426–30. Dolein states that the Red Sea question smacks rather of curiosity than of utility. For an extraordinary list of questions debated by the University, many by Hus, see Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 261–4, and cf. Vol. i. p. 148–9.

people the crusade against Ladislaus. So the legates said: "He is willing, you see, Lord Archbishop, to obey the commands of our sovereign Pope." So I said to them: "Sirs, understand me. I said that I am willing, with all my heart, to obey apostolic commands, but by apostolic commands I mean the doctrines of the apostles of Christ. So far as the commands of the Pope agree with the commands and doctrines of the apostles, and are after the rule of the law of Christ, so far I am heartily prepared to render them obedience. But if I see anything in them at variance with this, I will not obey, even if you kindle the fire for the burning of my body before my eyes."'[1]

In this spirit, on June 7, in spite of the opposition of the eight doctors of the theological faculty, led by 'the friend of his youth,' Stephen Palecz,[2] in answer to the determination of the friars to proclaim that 'the Pope is a God on earth,' Hus delivered his disputation against indulgences in the large hall of the University. His arguments, though urged with clearness, and aptly applied to the disputes of Gregory and John, need not detain us. "Down to the details, they are adopted with verbal fidelity from three tractates of Wyclif," a circumstance which the doctors were not slow to point out in their reply.[3] Pardon 'from pain and guilt,' he

[1] *Mon.*, i. 293*b*.

[2] *Doc.*, 448–51, 726.

[3] Loserth, 141. *Doc.*, 450, 222–3. For the disputations, see *Mon.*, i. 173–89, analysed by Neander, x. 404–12, and by Loserth, 236–46. Curious to say, Hus makes little use of Wyclif's *Cruciata*. According to Wylie, iii. 475, Hus quoted also from an English Lollard tract, whose author is unknown.

sneered, meant rather 'by purse and pocket.'[1] Priestly absolution, he maintained, is not in itself effectual, but only declaratory,—a position very similar to that of the English Prayer-Book.[2] John must have felt the awkardness of the thrust, that 'many Popes who have issued the fullest indulgences have been damned themselves' (*Mon.*, i. 184); while his question what John would do if a man killed the indulgence sellers, robbed them of their money, and then became penitent, but without offer of restitution, is both humorous and pertinent (*Mon.*, i. 185).

The counterblast of the theological faculty was soon forthcoming. Once more they condemned the forty-five articles of Wyclif, and, with the sanction of Wenzel, forbade their teaching, under penalty of expulsion from Bohemia. To these they now added six propositions from Hus.[3] Hus had previously challenged their judgment

[1] *Mon.*, i. 189*b*, a jest he repeats in a letter in 1413, *Doc.*, 58. *Mon.*, i. 189–91, would seem to be the notes of a sermon against indulgences, or of the address referred to in *Doc.*, 448.

[2] *Doc.*, 455 (5), which, however, differs from *ibid.* 170, where Hus owns that indulgences have value, but not 'pecuniales indulgentiæ.' So Jerome (Hardt, iv. 753).

[3] *Doc.*, 451–7, Wenzel's sanction, July 10. Published to the 'doctors, masters, priests,' in the town hall of the Old Town, July 16.

as regards two of the condemned articles in a dissertation, again taken, word for word, from Wyclif. The two articles were those which touched him closest, for they touched the duty and rights of preaching.[1] He followed this up by a defence of disendowment.[2] A third tractate in the same year, nominally on *Tithes*, contains an uncompromising defence of the weakest point of Wyclif's system. This was the doctrine of dominion founded on grace, the assertion, 'nullus est dominus civilis, nullus est prælatus, nullus est episcopus, dum est in mortali peccato.' Hus had moved far since his letter of the previous year to John.[3]

IV

The opposition of Hus to the indulgences had separated him for ever from his former friends, Stanislas and Palecz. For a while Palecz had wavered. A meeting on the matter was held at the rectory of Christan Prachaticz.

'If Palecz is willing to confess the truth, he will remember that he was the first to give me, with his own hand, the articles

[1] *Mon.*, i. 111–7 ; cf. *Doc.*, 329 (13 and 14). To this period assign *Doc.*, 27–9. See espec. 29, and *Mon.*, i. 144–8.

[2] *Mon.*, i. 117–25. Taken mainly from Wyclif's *De Ecclesia*. See Loserth, 225–235. But in *Doc.*, 170, Hus limits disendowment to bad priests.

[3] *Mon.*, i. 126–34. Cf. *Doc.*, 194, 291. On these treatises, see Neander, x. 385–90.

of indulgence, with the remark in writing (*manu*) that they contained palpable errors. I keep the copy to this day as a witness. But after he had consulted with another colleague, he went over to the other camp. The last word I said to him—for I have not spoken to him since—was this: "Palecz is my friend, Truth is my friend: of the two, it were only right to honour Truth most."'

The theologians, in fact, were unanimous that it was not their business to inquire into the value of the apostolic letters, but, 'as obedient sons, to obey, and fight those who opposed.'[1]

But Hus was not alone. To say nothing of 'the women without number' and 'powerful nobles' who rallied to him,[2] he was accompanied in his disputations by one whose name is closely linked with his own. The life of the rich young noble, familiarly known as Jerome of Prague, was one of incessant travel and adventure. He was the Ulrich von Hutten of the earlier Reformation. In 1398 he obtained his licentiate at Prague, and permission for two years' absence for study. So he went to Paris, Heidelberg, Cologne, and Oxford.[3] At Paris, the head-centre of Nominalism, his defence of the Realist Wyclif 'brought him under grave suspicion of heresy.' Gerson was taking steps for his arrest when he 'secretly

[1] *Mon.*, i. 264*b*, 175*a*; *Doc.*, 246, 223, 449, 725, 736.
[2] *Doc.*, 458; Dolein, *Antihussus*, 390.
[3] *Doc.*, 408; cf. *Mon.*, i. 82*a*; Hardt, iv. 645.

slipped away from the University.'[1] From Oxford he returned in 1401, bringing with him Wyclif's *Dialogue* and *Trialogue*.[2] In his rooms he hung a painting representing Wyclif as the Prince of Philosophers.[3] But the picture did not detain him in Prague. We find him soon back again at Oxford. There he was charged with heresy; but through the intercession of the University of Prague, of which he had been admitted a 'master,' he was released.[4] The University troubles of 1409 found him in Prague once more.[5] We next hear of him in Vienna, preaching Lollardism in the University, and excommunicated by the clergy of St. Stephen's.[6] Thence, 'like a sparrow from the net of the fowlers,' he escaped to Bietow in Moravia.[7] Its castle, wherein is shown to-day the helmet of Ziska, belonged to a friend of Hus. We then find him, a few weeks later, at Buda-Pesth, at the

[1] Hardt, iv. 680–1, 646.

[2] *Ibid.* iv. 634. That he was home in 1401, see *Doc.*, 175.

[3] Hardt, iv. 751, 654. Jerome denies that there was a halo round the head, 'as if a saint.'

[4] *Doc.*, 336–7. Early in 1408.

[5] *Doc.*, 282, 'cum socio tuo.' Cf. Hardt, iv. 636, last par.

[6] *Doc.*, 417–20, Sept. 1410. Excommunication sent to Zbinek, Sept. 30. Cf. Hardt, iv. 639. See *infra*, p. 167, n. 4. In Hardt, iv. 638, it is dated 1404. In *Doc.*, 408, there is a letter of Univ. Prague on his behalf.

[7] *Doc.*, 416, Sept. 12, 1410; Hardt, iv. 682–3.

court of Sigismund. There he was arrested, imprisoned for five days, and dismissed.[1] We next hear of him in Russia, *i.e.* in Russian Lithuania. There he allowed his beard to grow,[2] and according to his enemies became an adherent of the Greek Church. He even endeavoured, it was said, to induce its Duke Witold to apostatise.[3] In April 1411 he was once more back in Prague, receiving the sacrament, in spite of his excommunication, at the hand of the priest of St. Michael's, Christan Prachaticz.[4] We are also told of his 'putting his head out of a window in the Bethlehem during a sermon of Hus, and railing against Zbinek in the presence of a vast crowd.'[5]

[1] On the suit of Zbinek. Hardt, iv. 636. According to Hardt, iv. 637–8, he then returned to Vienna, and was arrested. Jerome pleaded that 'he was of another diocese.' Evidently there was only the episcopal, not papal, Inquisition at Vienna. But the dates in Hardt over Jerome's trial are hopeless.

[2] Not for the first time. He had dared to preach before Sigismund 'with a long beard' (Hardt, iv. 673, 753).

[3] Hardt, iv. 642, 677–80. To understand these charges, the student should remember the then strained relations in Lithuania, at that time an appanage of Poland, between Orthodox and Catholic. See Morfill's *Russia*, p. 46. The date seems doubtful, and is variously given in Hardt. I incline to date early in May 1411.

[4] Hardt, iv. 640. Dated Ap. 1410. This date is impossible. See *supra*, p. 166, n. 6.

[5] Hardt, iv. 641.

In 1412 Jerome, like a stormy petrel, was once more back in Prague, taking part in its trouble and riots. His fiery eloquence, which won the admiration of that fastidious critic, Poggio of Florence,[1] carried all before him. At the close of his discussion the excited students poured into the streets. Two pardoners were seized at their trade. 'Get out, you liars!' cried Jerome; 'the Pope, your master, is a lying heretic.'[2] Woksa of Waldstein drove up with a cart in which sat two harlots 'with the papal bulls tied round their breasts.' An armed mob conducted the procession through the streets, and burnt the bulls and pardons in the market-place of the New Town 'about the hour of vespers.'[3] A friar showing his relics was beaten. 'Those are only dead men's bones,' shouted the people; 'you are hoodwinking Christians.'[4] The civil authorities

[1] *Doc.*, 624. Cf. *Mon.*, i. 82; Hardt, iv. 650.

[2] Aug. 1412. Hardt, iv. 671.

[3] *Doc.*, 640; Hardt, iv. 671–2. "A student dressed up as a harlot" (Creighton, ii. 16). So Denis, 114. They follow the account left by Martin Lupac, who took part in the procession. The date seems to have been June 24. This buffoonery was laid, at Constance, at the door of Jerome, who denied it; Hardt, iv. 753, 645, 672; Pal. *Ges.*, iii. (1) 277–8; Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 172.

[4] Dolein, *Antihussus*, 380–2. In the Carmelite Church. Jerome (Hardt, iv. 751) denies that he was there, nor does Dolein impute it to him.

deemed it well to disclaim the riot, and issue an order that no one should preach against the indulgences. But no attempt was made to punish its leaders, or even deprive Woksa of his place at court. As for Jerome, he was off once more on his travels. In March 1413 he arrived at Cracow, shaved his beard, put on a red gown, and presented his passports to Ladislaus of Poland. Before many days were over he was once more in trouble 'over the articles of Wyclif.' Cracow was in an uproar; so he was put over the frontier, 'that he might plough in his own country, for our soil seems too dry to receive his seed.'[1] So he returned to Prague, to take part (May 1414) in a riot against crucifixes, in which, according to his enemies, 'a certain Wyclifist smith defiled the images with human dung.' As for the 'veil and robe of the glorious Virgin' in the Cathedral, 'it ought not,' said Jerome, 'to be held in greater reverence than the skin of the ass on which Christ sat' (Hardt, iv. 674–5).

In spite of Wenzel's warning,—perhaps before

[1] See the curious letter, *Doc.*, 506. Cf. *ibid.* 63, a letter of Hus, despatched July 1, 1413, to John Sybart of Vienna University, which bears a striking resemblance to a similar letter sent by the rector of Prague University on July 8 (*Doc.*, 512). I suspect that Hus stirred up the authorities on behalf of his friend. Vienna seems to have been at the bottom of the Cracow trouble.

it was officially promulgated,[1]—on July 10 three artisans cried out in a church that the indulgences were lies—'John Hus has taught us better than that.' They were condemned to death. Hus, attended by a vast throng, demanded a hearing, and declared: 'Their fault is mine; I will bear the consequences.' Evasive answers were given; but later in the day the prisoners were hurriedly executed, according to Hus without the king's orders.[2] The excitement was intense. Women —'beguines,' Dolein calls them—'dipped their 'kerchiefs in the blood' of the martyrs. Their bodies were shrouded in white linen, and borne to the Bethlehem Chapel. There, amid the chanting of the hymn, "Isti sunt sancti," and 'the mass for martyrs,' they were buried 'in the name of God.' Hus himself was not there; but his sympathies—'quos iste canonisavit,' sneered his opponents—were shown by the comment he made at a later date in his *De Ecclesia* on 'the three laymen who laid bare their necks to the sword because they contradicted the lying words of Antichrist.' When those words were read at Constance 'his judges gazed on each other as if in admiration.' Men had

[1] According to *Doc.*, 457, it was not read in the Council House until July 16.

[2] *Doc.*, 312.

perished at the stake for utterances less daring than this.[1]

'That Luther,' laughed Leo, when he heard of his outbreak against Tetzel, 'has a pretty wit.' John, however, was of a different mind. He scarcely needed the formal complaint of the clergy of Prague, stirred up by Michael the Pleader,[2] against 'that son of Belial, the Wyclifist Hus, a despiser of the keys.' 'Attend, Blessed Father,' they shrieked—

> 'Attend to your flock. Ravening wolves rush in upon it. . . . All procrastination must be laid aside lest that line of Vergil come true—
>
> "Facilis descensus Averni, sed revocare gradum
> Hoc opus, hic labor est."'

---

[1] For the incident of 'The Three Martyrs,' see *Doc.*, 726, 312–3, and the comments of Hus in his *De Ecclesia* (*Mon.*, i. 245*b*); as also, according to the editors of the *Monumenta* (1558), 'on the margin of a parchment book in the Bethlehem called *Passionale*' (*loc. cit.*). Also Hardt, iv. 676; Dolein, 380–1. Dolein needs care. For beguines among Hussites, cf. *ibid.* 382, 492.

[2] The activity of Michael the Pleader against Hus in the Fall of 1412 is most marked. See *Doc.*, 169–174, 23, 465. Michael Smradar (*Doc.*, 174), of Deutsch Brod, was at one time priest of St. Adalbert's, Prague. He next entered the king's service with a project for a new method of gold-mining. According to his enemies, he absconded with a part of the money, a tale we need not believe. The only authority I can find for it is the suspicious source in *Mon.*, i., pref. Its absence in Mladenowic—if true, he would not have left it out—condemns it, though accepted by Neander, x. 424, and others. He had returned with the office of papal 'procurator de causis fidei,' whence his name. From Hardt, iv. 759, we learn that he was a German.

John was in no mood for procrastination. He replied by pronouncing upon Hus the great curse. He was declared cut off from 'food, drink, buying, selling, conversation, hospitality, the giving of fire and water, and all other acts of kindness.' If within twenty-three days he did not yield, he was to be excommunicated 'in all churches, monasteries, and chapels,' with the usual custom of 'lighted candles, extinguished and thrown to the ground.' Places which gave him shelter were to be subject to interdict. 'Three stones were to be hurled against his house as a sign of perpetual curse.' In a second Bull the Bethlehem Chapel was ordered to be rased to the ground, and the person of Hus to be delivered up and burned.[1]

Hus replied by a dignified appeal, which he read in the Bethlehem, from the Pope to 'the supreme and just Judge who is neither influenced by gifts . . . nor deceived by false witnesses'—

[1] Full text of excommunication, *Doc.*, 461–4. Not dated, but, according to *ibid.* 202, in July 1412. On p. 460 of the complaint of the clergy (*Doc.*, 467–61) there seems a reference to the command to burn the books of Wyclif in the square of St. Peter's. This was formally carried out, Feb. 2, 1413 (*supra*, p. 82). According to the heading, the complaint was engrossed in the Curia—'fiat per omnia ut petitur'—Dec. 1412. Palacky (*Doc.*, 457 n.) decides, not without reason, that it was written "before June 1412." If so, it must have been altered on engrossing. Both forms of the complaint are, however, without date. For the second Bull, Palacky, *Ges.*, iii. (1) 286.

"golden knights" and the rest (*supra*, p. 151). His only hope lay in the meeting of a General Council. Meanwhile he exhorted the people to put their trust in neither Pope, Church, nor Prelates, but in God alone.[1] As for himself,—a matter which told clearly against him at Constance,—he showed how little he cared for the censures of Rome by continuing, as before, his public preaching.[2]

The excommunication and attendant interdict soon produced its effect in Prague. 'The people,' complained Hus, 'do not show sufficient courage to remain without the Pope's religion, to bury their dead in unconsecrated ground, and baptize their children themselves.'[3] On Oct. 2[4] an attack was made upon the Bethlehem Chapel, chiefly, says Hus, by the Germans: 'What madness! . . . what German audacity! . . . they are not allowed to pull down a bakehouse: the temple

[1] *Doc.*, 464–6, 281, 192; *Mon.*, i. 235*b*, 168*a*. I do not see on what grounds Creighton calls this appeal "a curious piece of formalism to maintain himself still within the communion of the Church" (ii. 18). For Hus's views at this time, see his *De Credere* (*Mon.*, i. 169*b*–170*b*).

[2] *Doc.*, 203.

[3] *Doc.*, 727.

[4] According to Hardt, iv. 666–7, there was a riot on Sept. 30, 1412, in which Jerome helped to duck 'friar Nicholas' in the Moldau. The riot of the Germans was perhaps the reply. All the rioting was certainly not, as Hus would have it, on one side.

of God, where the bread of God's Word is distributed, they wish to destroy.' But the Czechs rallied to their national cause and prevented the outrage.[1] 'Antichrist,' wrote Hus, 'is as powerless as a dog tied up with a chain.' But elsewhere the opponents of Hus were victorious.[2] In the University, Stanislas of Znaim and Stephen Palecz were inveighing against their former friend in the presence of Duke Ernest of Austria.[3] Nor was he helped by the formal proof of his ally, John of Jesenic, doctor of canon law, that the excommunication was illegal.[4]

Hus himself had left Prague on the advice of Wenzel, a step which at first he was reluctant to take. In his perplexity he had sought counsel of his colleague at the Bethlehem, Nicholas Miliczin. Ought he to follow the advice which Augustine had given in the like case of Bp. Honoratus, or ought he to remember the words of the Saviour, 'The good shepherd gives his life for the sheep'? For himself, he was drawn to 'the beautiful statement of the blessed Augustine,' especially remembering the illustration Augustine

[1] *Doc.*, 727–8, 36, 39.

[2] In Nov. 1412. See *Doc.*, 36, 34.

[3] *Doc.*, 311, Oct. 1412.

[4] Dec. 18, 1412. Given at length *Mon.*, i. 334–43 ; cf. Hus's remarks, *ibid.* i. 248–9.

gave from the case of St. Athanasius.[1] But Wenzel was persistent. The king, in fact, was placed in an awkward position by the calling in of the secular arm.[2] So before the outrage on the Bethlehem,[3] Hus left Prague,—his enemies claimed that he was expelled,[4]—'that a Synod for settlement might be held with more chance of success.' 'They have laid their gins, citations, anathemas,' he writes, 'for the Goose. They are now setting their snares for some of you. But the Goose, though a tame bird, has broken their snares, though his flight is not lofty.' His consolation is this—

'Priests, scribes, Pharisees, Herod, Pilate, and the other inhabitants of Jerusalem condemned the truth, handed it over to death and buried it. But it rose again and conquered them all, and sent forth in its place twelve other preachers. . . . If, therefore, the God of truth is with us, who shall be able to stand against us in this warfare? What fear, what death, shall separate us from Him? What shall we lose if for His sake we lose our wealth, our friends, the honours of this world, our poor life? Then at last we shall be delivered from this bondage, to receive riches a hundredfold more splendid, friends far dearer, and a fuller joy, of which death cannot rob us. For he who dies for Christ wins the victor's crown' (*Doc.*, 36-41).

---

[1] *Doc.*, 33-4.

[2] Formally called in, Dec. 1412, *Doc.*, 203.

[3] 'Ut audio,' *Doc.*, 39. In September, therefore. Palacky (*Doc.*, 727) dates differently (Dec. 1412).

[4] *Doc.*, 203.

Nine letters of Hus, written in the Fall of 1412, have been preserved for us.[1] They were written to his friends, his church at Prague. They are naturally, therefore, pastoral, even sermonic, in character, adapted for reading in public to his congregation. But whether Hus is urging meditation on the Second Coming, writing on Christmas Day on the joy of the Incarnation, enlarging on the 'peace of Christ,' or pouring out his woes against priests who neither preach themselves nor allow others, that personal note which gives such charm to the story of Hus is never absent. We may safely assert that in the years to come the letters of Hus will form the only part of his voluminous writings that will be read. For the works of Hus are for the most part mere copies of Wyclif, oftentimes whole sections of the great Englishman's writings transferred bodily, without alteration or acknowledgment.[2] The very titles are not original; their

[1] *Doc.*, 34–51.

[2] Of the literal fidelity with which Hus plagiarised Wyclif we may note his incorporation of the famous passage from Wyclif's *De Trip. Vinculo Amoris*, about Anne of Luxembourg and her Bible, with its three translations, without even altering it to suit the fact that Anne had been dead, when he wrote, for sixteen years. See *Mon.*, i. 108*b*, and cf. Vol. i. p. 204. Note that the passage in Wyclif is supposition only (Loserth, 261). Compare also his statement that in Bohemia 'more than a fourth part of the land is held by clerics in mortmain, and

parade of learning, which deceived Luther, is completely borrowed. The Englishman Stokes was right when, at Constance, he bluntly asked: 'Why do you glory in these writings, falsely labelling them your own, since, after all, they belong not to you but Wyclif, in whose steps you are following?'[1] To the same end was the taunt of his old friend, Andrew Brod: 'Was Wyclif crucified for us? were we baptized in his name?' His originality and independence was, in fact, moral rather than intellectual: 'Whatever truth Wyclif has taught, I receive, not because it is the truth of Wyclif, but because it is the truth of Christ.'[2] From this truth Hus 'would not depart for a chapel full of gold.'

The case is otherwise with Hus's letters, eighty-six of which have escaped the ravages of Time.[3] The preservation of these we owe, for

their estates daily grow,' which is also from Wyclif, and so valueless for Bohemia (*Mon.*, i. 122).

[1] *Doc.*, 308, 519. The dependence of Hus upon Wyclif was well known to Hus's contemporaries. See Loserth, *op. cit.* pp. xviii, 75–87, 65, n. 2; and cf. *Doc.*, 185, 203, 522. The matter is evident, also, in every page of Dolein's *Medulla*.

[2] *Doc.*, 184; cf. *Mon.*, i. 264*a*.

[3] Of these, sixty-five only are in the *Monumenta*; nine were first published by Höfler, *Gesch. der hus. Bewegung*, 1865; the remainder by Palacky. The readings, order, etc., of the *Monumenta* often chaotic and misleading. Many letters are lost; cf. *Doc.*, 518; Loserth, 337.

the most part, to the care of Peter Mladenowic, the secretary of John of Chlum. They form a priceless memorial of one of the truest-hearted of the sons of God. His later correspondence, especially his letters from exile and prison, show John Hus to be one of the chosen few who exalt humanity. But in the whole series there is nothing that is unworthy, little that is tedious. "Everything Hus writes is the result of his own soul's experience, is penetrated with a deep moral earnestness, illuminated with a boldness and a self-forgetfulness that breathes the spirit of the cry, 'Let God be true and every man a liar.'"[1] We feel, as we read, how human he was, how lovable, how truly his life was hid with Christ. We can still trace the agony of self-conquest, the slow steps by which he won the victory.

On the retirement of Hus, Wenzel, on the advice of his Council, gave orders for a Synod to meet at Böhmisch Brod,[2] a small town belonging to the archbishop. The Synod in reality assembled at Prague, on February 6th, at the very time at which, in Rome, they were publicly

[1] Creighton, ii. 21.

[2] Jan. 3rd (*Doc.*, 472–474), to meet Feb. 2nd. For the Synod (Feb. 6–10), see *Doc.*, 475–505, also *Doc.*, 52. Jesenic's paper (*Doc.*, 495–501) is most interesting. One argument is noteworthy: 'The pope could reside at Prague, just as the Empire has been translated to the Germans.'

burning the works of Wyclif in the great square of St. Peter's (*supra*, p. 82). All parties laid their memorials before it: the theological faculty, the artists,—inspired, it would appear, by John of Jesenic,—and the Reformers. The opponents of Hus, chief among whom was "the iron bishop," John of Leitomischl, insisted that the papal decisions and the excommunication of Hus must be upheld, 'that a vice-chancellor be appointed to search out and punish the errors of masters and scholars,' and that 'the Czech writings of Hus—the stalks of these accursed tares and schism—be placed under an anathema.' Hus, on his part, in his 'conditions of peace,'—he was not there in person,—demanded the upholding of the decision of Zbinek of July 6, 1411. He harped much on the injury done to the realm by the accusations of heresy. Let the heretic be named, if known. On the personal charge he was prepared to defend himself, under penalties, against all opponents. His most important demand—one that shows also the influence of Wyclif—is his claim that the Civil Courts must be supreme 'in all approbations, condemnations, and other acts concerning Mother Church.' Hus was followed by Jakoubek, who put in a plea that peace without a real reform would be valueless. The Synod was dissolved without result,

and Hus retired once more to his asylum at the castle of Kozi hradek, near Austi.

Meanwhile Wenzel made one more attempt at compromise. A Commission of four was appointed, with the ex-archbishop Albik at the head; both parties bound themselves, 'under a penalty of sixty thousand groschen and exile from the realm,' to accept its verdict. Hus himself again was absent. He was represented by 'his proctor, John of Jesenic, with him Jakoubek of Mies and Simon of Tissnow,' while on the Commission itself was his friend, Christan Prachaticz. At the first meeting, in April, it was evident that neither side would accept anything less than a verdict in their favour. 'The counsel of the theological faculty,' wrote Hus, 'I would not accept, even if I were standing before a fire prepared for me.'[1] Stanislas said that he was wishful for peace, but the others must agree to his declaration of faith—

'that the Pope is the head of the Roman Church, the cardinals the body, that all its decisions in matters of faith are true, that the contrary opinions of the Wyclifists are false and erroneous.'

The other side thereupon 'horribly yelled against us for two days.' The 'horrible yelling' was really an effort to accomplish the impossible—to mix oil and water, the principles of Rome and

[1] *Doc.*, 55. See *supra*, p. 142 n.

the Reformation. Jesenic was willing to yield to Palecz's definition of the Church, provided he were allowed to add to the statement of the faith and obedience due a saving clause, 'such as every good and faithful Christian ought, or is bound, to give.' This loophole for private judgment and the Scriptures was of course impossible.[1] Even this, on reflection, seemed to Hus to be granting too much. In his letters to Christan he points out the difficulties of such a view of the Church. These difficulties, chiefly copied from Wyclif, he afterwards expanded into his *De Ecclesia*. 'I wish to know,' he writes, 'if Pope Liberius the heretic, Leo the heretic, and Pope Joan, who was confined of a boy, were the heads of the Roman Church.' He holds that 'though Rome, were it possible, were overthrown, with its Pope and cardinals, as Sodom, still the Holy Church would remain.' He is willing to receive the Pope as the vicar of Christ, provided he is predestinate.[2] The absolute confusion that would

[1] For Palecz's account of this assembly, 'scriptum festinanter,' on the eve of his exile, see *Doc.*, 507–10; cf. 737. For a sarcastic comment by Hus on this definition of Stanislas, prompted by the crimes and flight of John, see *ibid.* 125.

[2] *Doc.*, 57–61; cf. his *De Eccles.* in *Mon.*, i. 207*a*, 220*a*. Pope Joan—Agnes, as he often calls her—was a favourite argument with Hus. He gives her history in detail. For Joan, see Döllinger, *Fables respecting Popes during M.A.*

have resulted from basing Church order upon an unknowable factor does not seem to have occurred to him. 'O Master, but not in Israel,' inquired Andrew Brod, 'are you sure about your own predestination?' (*Doc.*, 519).

The meeting was a failure, but the Wyclifists retained the ear of the king. Wenzel relieved his disappointment by banishing Stanislas of Znaim, Stephen Palecz, and two other opponents of Hus, as the 'authors of dissension.'[1] Stanislas —'out of whose head,' says Hus, 'the greater part of this nonsense had come'—spent the rest of his days in writing bitter tractates against Wyclif and Hus. He died at Neuhaus, in Bohemia, from an abscess, when on the point of setting out for his revenge at Constance. Hus and Palecz were destined to meet again.[2]

This victory for Hus was followed by a political success. Hitherto, in the Old Town of Prague, the Germans ruled the Council.[3] On Oct. 21st Wenzel issued an order transferring to the Crown the "pricking" of the eighteen coun-

[1] Cf. *Doc.*, 509. Stanislaus una mecum concordiam impedivit. Palecz's own confession.

[2] *Doc.*, 510–11, 246; *Mon.*, i. 220. A list of Stanislas' writings in Loserth, 160 n.; cf. 339–42. For the writings of Palecz, *ibid.* 161, n. 2.

[3] From Hardt, iv. 758, we learn there were sixteen Germans, two Czechs. See also Loserth, 162.

cillors, nine from each nation. In the New Town the Czechs had long possessed the control. Prague was now committed to his side. The Church authorities were powerless. Albik had resigned, or rather exchanged, his archbishopric with Conrad of Vechta, who in later years became a Hussite. His creed at this time was probably opportunism; at anyrate he was not yet inducted (July 17, 1413). Nevertheless, Hus deemed it well to stay in the country, first at Kozi hradek,[1] then, that he might be nearer the capital, at the castle of Krakowec. 'Here he remained,' says the Chronicler, 'until such time as he went to Constance.' He spent his time, apart from visits to Prague,[2] in a lively correspondence with his friends, especially Christan de Prachaticz, the rector of the University,[3] and in composing, as his answer to recent charges, his great work *On the Church*. Of this famous treatise Niem remarked, at Constance, that it 'attacks the papal power and the pleni-

[1] The later well-known Tabor was founded near this place.

[2] *E.g.* Ap. 20, 1414, Loserth, 162, n. 3. See also *Doc.*, 521, 728, for a longer visit in the spring of 1414, 'from Christmas Day to Easter.' The visit is borne out by the absence of letters to his church. Hus tells us he even preached in the Bethlehem, whereupon the clergy at once began an interdict.

[3] For the circumstances of his election, see *Doc.*, 737. See also p. 127, n. 1.

tude of its authority as much as the Alcoran the Catholic faith.'[1] But it contains hardly a line, local colouring and polemics apart, "which does not proceed from Wyclif."[2] On its completion it was sent to Prague and publicly read (July 8, 1413) in the Bethlehem Chapel, on the walls of which the main positions of his pamphlet *De Sex Erroribus* had already been set up in large text. 'You paint,' sneered Brod, 'the Ten Commandments on your walls; would that you kept them in your heart.'[3]

The letters of Hus to Christan of Prachaticz are full of the sentiments and arguments of the *De Ecclesia*. We see, in fact, the larger treatise in process of becoming. In other ways Hus was preparing for the future. 'I exhort you,' he cries,

'be ready for the battle. Needs must the Goose flap its wings against the wings and tail of Behemoth.[4] . . . What

[1] Gerson, *Opera*, ii. 901; Hardt, i. (5) 307. All the historians, Creighton, Neander, Loserth, etc., attribute this remark to D'Ailli. This is remarkable in the case of Creighton, for he rightly attributes the *De Necessitate Reformationis*, where it is found, to Niem. See Appendix B. For Niem's hatred of the Czechs, see his *De Vita Johannis* (Hardt, ii. 451–3).

[2] Loserth, 156, 210. For the treatise, see *Mon.*, i. 196–255, analysed Neander, x. 433–44, and, with more accuracy, Loserth, 181–224. For the *De Sex Erroribus* see *Mon.*, i. 191–196; Loserth, 247–52.

[3] *Doc.*, 519; cf. *Mon.*, i. 191*b*, i. 249*b*.

[4] See Milicz, *Anatomia Antichristi* (*Mon.*, i. 362*b*; cf. ii. 82).

greater abomination is there than a harlot who should offer herself publicly? Yes, there is the greater abomination of the Beast, which, sitting in high places, offers himself to be adored by every comer as if he were God, and is ready to sell whatever a man may care to buy in spiritual matters; yea, and sells what he does not possess. Woe is me if I should not preach, weep, and write against such an abomination' (*Doc.*, 54–55).

His literary labours, among which must be reckoned many treatises in Czech, did not interfere with his toils in the gospel. Hus followed Wyclif in the stress he laid upon preaching. 'Preachers,' he said, 'in my judgment count for more in the Church than prelates.' So, on leaving Prague, he once more resumed his sermons. 'I think,' he wrote, 'I did wrong in giving them up at the wish of the King. I am unwilling to do wrong any longer.' 'Hitherto,' he continues,

'I have preached in towns and market-places; now I preach behind hedges, in villages, castles, fields, woods. If it were possible, I would preach on the seashore, or from a ship, as my Saviour did.'

He specially mentions, as a favourite pulpit, 'a lime-tree near Kozi.' One thing gravely distressed him. 'Jesus went to preach on foot, not like our modern preachers, proudly carried in a carriage. I, alas, drive.' His excuse is necessity. 'I could not otherwise possibly get in time to places so far distant.'[1]

[1] *Doc.*, 728-9, cf. 43, and Nowotny, *op. cit.* (Feasts) ii. 8, 21.

We have mentioned Hus's treatises in Czech. The most important of these was his *Postilla*,[1] or Sermons on the Gospel for each Sunday in the year. The influence of Hus upon his native language is comparable to that of Wyclif in English, of Luther in German. He reformed the Bohemian alphabet by his invention of the diacritical signs, for the use of which he laid down rules that are still in use. By his Czech writings he followed Thomas Stitny (*supra*, p. 119) in founding a national literature. He regarded the use of Czech in a pure form as a mark of patriotism. In his exposition of the Ten Commandments he sharply attacked the citizens of Prague for mixing their Bohemian speech with German words. They were, he said, like the 'Jews who had married wives of Ashdod, and whose children spake half in the speech of Ashdod.'

As the result of Hus's labours, his doctrines spread on every hand, both in cottage and castle, in Prague and in the country. We see this consciousness of success in the proud

[1] Written Sept. 1413. For the *Postil*, see *supra*, p. 90; and on the Czech writings of Hus, Lützow, *Boh. Lit.*, 123–30; Palacky, *Gesch.*, iii. (1) 299; Denis, *op. cit.* 67 n. For the two hymns ascribed to Hus, still sung by the Moravian Church, see Schweinitz, 46 n.

answer of Hus, at Constance, to the questions of D'Ailli:

'Yes, I have said that I came here of my own free will. If I had been unwilling to come here, neither that king (Wenzel) nor this (Sigismund) would have been able to force me to come, so numerous and so powerful are the Bohemian nobles who love me, and within whose castles I should have been able to lie concealed.'

At this the bystanders began to murmur. D'Ailli, with a shake of his head, cried out, 'What effrontery!' 'He speaks truth,' said John of Chlum.

'I am a poor knight in our realm, but I should have been glad to have kept him for a year, whoever liked it or disliked it, so that no one would have been able to get him. There are numbers of great nobles who love him, who have strong castles. They could keep him as long as they wished, even against both these kings' (*Doc.*, 283).

This consciousness of a national party at his back explains the readiness with which Hus went to Constance, his strange optimism as to the result, and the later uprising of Bohemia against the verdict of the Council and the tyranny of Rome.

CHAPTER V

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE

Hoc Constantiense concilium, cujus hic finis est, omnibus quae processerunt, generalibus conciliis fuit in congregando difficilius, in progressu singularius, mirabilius, et periculosius et tempore diuturnius.—CARD. FILLASTRE in his Journal (*F.Q.*, 242).

Unser Herr, der König (Sigismund), hat in seiner Hand Himmel und Hölle, kann das Schlimmste und das Beste thun, bei ihm liegt nächst Gott alle Seligkeit der Christenheit.—M S. in Finke, *F.Q.*, 28.

Parturiunt montes, nascetur ridiculus mus.

I. Sources.

The main source is the great work of Hermann von der Hardt, *Magnum Constantiense Concilium* (6 vols., printed at Helmstadt, 1700–2). Hardt's "monumental industry is only equalled by his monumental confusion." This last is a little lessened if the student begin with vol. iv., at the beginning of which (pp. 17–51) he will find *Fasti*, giving the chronology of the Council, and serving as a guide through the chaos. Vol. iv. should at anyrate be studied, and is comparatively easy. It is a history of the Council itself. Vol. i. contains a vast mass of diverse matters, the confusion being made worse by its pagination by "parts"; Dietrich Vrie's *Hist. Conc. Const.*; Clémanges' *Vota Emendationis, De Ruina Ecclesiæ*, sundry works attributed to Gerson and D'Ailli, and other Conciliarist literature (further particulars will be found in the notes). Vol. ii. contains Henry Langenstein's *Concilium Pacis*, the *Acta Pisani Conc.*; Niem's treatises on *John XXIII.*, and documents connected with the obstinacy of Benedict and the reunion of the Church. Vol. iii. is chiefly occupied with the affairs of Wyclif, Hus, the Flagellants, and the Utraquists. Vol. v. is a very interesting and short scrap-heap of external odds and ends, coats of arms, etc. Vol. vi. gives more Conciliar literature, chiefly in defence. In 1742 a seventh vol. (Index) was published at Berlin by Bohnstedt.

The great work of Finke, *Acta Conc. Const.*, is as yet incomplete, vol. i., the transactions before Constance, alone being published (1896). Finke's *Forschungen und Quellen zur Geschichte des Konstanzer Konzils* (Paderborn, 1889) is most valuable, and gives an earnest of what is to come. I have quoted largely, as probably unfamiliar to my readers, from the vivid *Diary of Cardinal Fillastre*, which Finke has here first printed. I have indicated in the notes many other ways in which Finke supplements or corrects Hardt or Mansi.

In addition to Hardt, or rather in place of Hardt, for they add little, the student may prefer to use the clearer type and arrangement of LABBE, vol. xvi., with Mansi's *Supplementum*, vol. iv. (slight), or of MANSI (Raynald), vol. xxviii. Both these incorporate, with additions, JEROME OF CROARIA (a lawyer of Tübingen), *Acta Conc. Const.*, printed at Hagenau in 1500. [There is a copy of this in the Aberdeen Univ. Library. It is of interest as printed from the MS. used at the Council of Basel, but otherwise is of little value. See *infra*, p. 362.] As a rule, I have cited only from Hardt, occasionally, for special reasons, from Labbe. The *Chronique du Religieux de St. Denis* is evidently by an eye-witness, probably by the French friar, Peter of Versailles.

The most valuable of the diaries is that of ULRICH REICHENTAL, *Costnitzer Concilium*. Three MSS. exist, of one of which—the Constance MS.—there is in the British Museum a most interesting photographic reproduction, coloured, by WOLF (Constance, 1869). This contains 177 arms of bishops, 408 of gentlemen and cities, 747 coats in all, all made by Reichental himself (see *infra*, p. 201). His drawings are numerous and interesting, and show the events which would strike a superior "man in the street." I have drawn attention in my note to some of the most important. The coats of arms have found their way into Hardt. His Diary has been extensively used by all writers—Lenfant, Hardt, etc. The chief passages are given in MARMOR, *Das Concil zu Constance* (1858), and the whole has been printed by M. R. BUCK, *Reichental's Chronik des Cons. Concils* (Tübingen, 1882), as well as in the rarer editions, which I have not examined (Augsburg, 1483, 1538, and Frankfort, 1575). As Buck and Marmor are both without the plates, the student should, if possible, see WOLF. [In citing, I have generally given the pages in BUCK.] There is also in the British Museum a *St. Petersburg reproduction* from a different MS., with translations in Russian, Latin, French, of less interest.

II. Modern Works.

In addition to Lenfant, Creighton, Hefele, and others already mentioned, the student should note the following :—

J. K. Wylie, *The C. Constance to the Death of Hus* (the Ford Lecture for 1900), strong in chatty details, necessarily incomplete, and without a single note (a contrast to his *Henry IV.* !)

Max Lenz, *K. Sigismund and H. V. von England* (Berlin, 1874), and J. Caro, *Das Bündniss von Canterbury* (1880), which deal with Sigismund's relation to England, and the effect on the Council. Caro's *Aus der Kanzlei Sigismund* (Vienna, 1879), to which *Das Bündniss* is a supplement, I have not been able to see. For English sources on the same subject, see Wilkins, *Concilia*, vol. iii., or Rymer, *Fœdera*, vol. ix.

For the affairs of Hus, see the next chapter.

The fact that three of our chief "sources" for the Council—Dietrich Niem, Gobelin Persona, and Dietrich Vrie—were all Westphalians has naturally attracted attention in Germany. On Vrie, see Finke, *F.Q.*, c. 3; on Niem, *ibid.* c. 8 and Appendix, p. 347. A life of D'Ailli has been written by Tschackert, who also contributed the article to Herzog. See also Hardt, vol. i., and Dupin, *Gerson*, vol. i. For Gerson, see *supra*, p. 52.

THE COUNCIL OF CONSTANCE

I

ON October 1, 1414, John XXIII. set out from Bologna for Constance. On hearing of the death of Ladislaus, he had sought to escape his promise, and return to Rome, but was prevented by his cardinals. The Pope's journey took exactly four weeks. In those days there was but one carriage-way from Italy to the north, the old Roman road by the Brenner. With the approach of winter even this route was not without its perils. Crossing the Arlberg, the Pope was violently hurled from his sledge into the snow. His attendants crowded round him, anxiously inquiring if he were hurt. 'No,' he replied; 'but in the devil's name, here I lie; I had done better to remain at Bologna.'[1] He felt acutely the pressure of the political necessities which had driven him to Constance; his confidence in the treaty he had concluded

[1] Reichental, 25. See the picture in Wolf.

with Sigismund was slight.[1] On his way he deemed it wise to make friends at Meran, though with the utmost secrecy, with Frederic of Austria,—'Frederic of the Empty Pockets,'—the enemy of Sigismund and of the whole house of Luxembourg (Oct. 15). By the aid of Frederic, whose territories and castles almost surrounded Constance, and with the help of his Italian bishops and cardinals, above all, by the persuasiveness of the enormous treasure that he carried with him, John intended to manage the Council for his own purposes.[2] But as he approached Constance, his consciousness of the lack of the necessary finesse to control not a camp, but an assembly of skilled ecclesiastics, made him more despondent. 'A ditch,' he cried, 'a ditch where forces are trapped.' He realised that his vices had robbed him of the prestige of his high office, and exposed him to dangers which his predecessors would have scorned.

'On Sunday, October 28th, the Lord Pope entered Constance in state, and took up his quarters in the bishop's palace. It was afterwards arranged that the Council should be opened with a procession and high mass on

[1] For this treaty, see Hardt, ii. (9) 145–6; Lenfant, i. 14.

[2] Niem, *Vita Joh.*; Hardt, ii. 388. See the picture of the treasure in Wolf's Reichental.

Saturday, November 3rd'—the very day on which Hus and his friends rode into the city. But on that Saturday, continues Fillastre,

'Pope, cardinals, and all the prelates and clergy were gathered together in the palace, vestments donned, and the procession arranged. This was ready to start, in fact the Pope had come out of his room, when illness seized him. He was obliged to go back, doff his vestments, and lie down on his bed.'[1]

Two days later John had recovered, and opened the Council. The first session was held on Friday, the 16th.

'The Pope presided, conducted the mass, and preached. His text was, "Seek after truth." His divisions were three—Eternal, Internal, and External Truth. . . . But from the beginning of November to the end of January nothing whatever was done, nor any steps taken as regards union. In fact, there was a scab afflicting some, called "Touch me not" (*noli me tangere*).[2] Those even who were anxious to move, dare not take steps, in the absence of the French and English, with whom all hopes lay.'[3]

At two in the morning of Christmas Day, Sigismund arrived in Constance.[4] After drinking

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 163. A reason for delay not found elsewhere, and which clears up a difficulty.

[2] Wylie, *C.C.*, 74, curiously mistakes this for a real disease.

[3] Finke, *F.Q.*, 163–4. On the ceremonies in all public sessions, see Hardt, v. 104–7; Lenfant, i. 33. The noble prayer always used should be read.

[4] He gave as an excuse for delay, a struggle at Cologne between two claimants for the see—one John's nominee, the other Gregory's (*F.Q.*, 249). There are four plates in Wolf of Sigismund's entrance.

Malmsey 'for about an hour,' the imperial party proceeded, while it was yet dark, to the cathedral. There, 'for eleven continuous hours, did John engage in divine worship,'—sorely, we imagine, against the grain,—while Sigismund, in due course, read the gospel for the day,—'There went out a decree from Cæsar Augustus,'—which, no doubt, he realised to be a very appropriate Scripture.[1]

Until March 2nd, the second session, no further public steps were taken. The weeks between were occupied with the arrival of the delegates, countless committees, and the plots and counter-plots of those who wished to shape the Council to their own purposes, or who were watching for the first false move of their opponents—'the scab *noli me tangere*.' A lively wrangle arose over the claims of the envoys of Gregory and Benedict 'to enter with a red hat,' and affix the papal arms on their lodgings. The decision in their favour showed John the dangerous cross-currents into which he had drifted. Meanwhile, in spite of his early emphasis that 'the Council was the continuation of the Council of Pisa,'[2] John flung away his chances of recognition by irregularity of hours, 'failing to say his prayers,'

[1] *F.Q.*, 252; Hardt, iv. 28; Vrie in Hardt. i. (1) 154–6.
[2] Hardt, ii. 188–92, and espec. 214–8.

'forgetting to appear in his pontifical robes,' and, generally, 'degrading the papal estate in the eyes of the nations.'[1]

While the Council is gathering, it were well to form some picture of its appearance. In few places can the imagination so easily reproduce the past as in Constance; yet it is not without difficulty that we can conceive of this little town of 5500 people filled with one of the greatest gatherings of notables ever known in history. Wrapped in a vision of other days, you wander out into the narrow streets. This Kaufhaus[2]—the hall in which the conclave sat—is itself an unaltered survival of the past. The massive oaken pillars, the low roof and dim light, all

[1] See the curious memoir, Hardt, iv. 25; Lab. xvi. 25, on Dec. 7.

[2] The name *Kaufhaus*, or *cheaphouse*, shows its origin. It was a public warehouse for ship-borne goods, built some thirty years before the Council. See Fillastre's account of it, Finke, *F.Q.*, 231, who points out one of its advantages, 'that it was not near to any building.' The idea that it was the place where the Council met is very old. Wyngfield (*infra*, p. 257) was shown it as such (Hardt, v. 53). At the commencement of Hardt, iv., there is an excellent picture-map of Constance as it was in 1699. It was then surrounded by a double wall, and the monastery of the Franciscans is clearly shown (*infra*, p. 313). But the picture makes a mistake in putting the 'rogus Hussii' near the Capuchin Church. See *infra*, p. 331, n. 2. The isolation of the Kaufhaus is also clearly seen.

help you to fill it once more with the cardinals and deputies who here made history. The Council itself—in spite of what the guide-books say—always held its sessions in the cathedral, not the existing building, rebuilt in 1435, but its predecessor. The Bishop's Palace, opposite the cathedral, where the Curia lodged, is destroyed. But here, still standing, is the house where Frederic, Burggraf of Nuremberg, was invested with the Mark of Brandenburg. Does the reader realise all that means? This is indeed a notable event in world history. For four hundred thousand gulden—three hundred thousand pounds, in present value more than two millions—the needy Sigismund has sold the vacant fief to the thrifty Hohenzollerns. In that house begins the story of the rise of Prussia (April 30, 1415). Strange how altered would have been the future of Europe but for this mercantile transaction! Frederick the Great would have been the petty count of a petty fief, and Germany—but it is useless to speculate. Two years later (Sunday, April 17, 1417) the transaction was completed by the investiture of Frederic with his new electorate, at the house in the Ober-Markt with the sign of the *Zum hohen Hafen*, 'one hundred thousand people,' say the old records, 'looking on from

roofs and windows.'[1] Thus began that cycle of events which ended in the descendants of Nuremberg Frederic receiving the crown of the reconstructed empire in the hall of Versailles.

Almost next door is the old house—over the doors is the legend *Curia Pacis*—where Frederic Barbarossa—he who still sleeps beneath the hills of Salzburg — concluded peace with the Lombard towns (1183). No less momentous event this than the last! Since Charles the Great no mightier lord had ruled the Holy Roman Empire, and yet the Italian cities have wrested from him their independence. In the one house the power of the purse gave birth to Prussia; here you mark the rise of the greater Italian republics.

Not far away is another house. A tablet and a portrait tell that here Hus lodged, 'in the house of a good widow,' until his arrest. A few steps lower down is the prison of Jerome of Prague. Hus himself was confined for a time in one of the cells—'close to the mouth of a sewer'—of the old Dominican monastery, the church of which is now the dining-room of your hotel. In this very hall

[1] For the curious ceremonies, see Lenfant, ii. 467, and picture 465; or Hardt, v. 183–8, from Dacher. Better in Wolf's Reichental (four plates).

three times was Hus brought up for trial. Here also were the headquarters of the French and Italian nations; the English and German met at the Greyfriars. Strange scenes of far-off days come to you as you sit at meat. The waiters vanish, and in their place appear the frocked monks and the stir and life of the old city of the Council.

You pass out into the streets: they are so full that it is with difficulty you force your way. One hundred thousand strangers,—more, say some,—from every court and see of Europe, are lodged within the little town. On all sides you hear the babel of conflicting nations; English, Spanish, French, Italian, German, Dane, and Pole jostling each other in the narrow streets, or gazing with wonder on the Greeks, Russians, and Ethiopians from Prester John, whose tongue no man could speak.[1] Four-and-twenty interpreters have been provided for the seven-and-twenty different languages the curious can detect. The great ones of the earth are here. There are one hundred dukes and earls, the representatives of eighty-three kings and princes. Add to these, 29 cardinals, 33 archbishops, and 250 bishops.[2] Nor must we forget

[1] Cf. Finke, *F.Q.*, 78, n. 1.
[2] Lab., xvi. 786, from Binius.

the deputies of 116 cities — in themselves a sign of the new age. The simple priests alone numbered 18,000, not to mention 578 doctors in law or theology, 1400 licensed Masters, 142 bull-writers, and 600 official scribes. Of poor students and clerks the number is legion, for the Archbishop of Salzburg has promised to provide us all with a loaf of bread a day, with soup and meat at feasts. Add to these the great host of laymen—80,000, say some—whom the manifold business of Church and State has brought to the Parliament of Nations.

The friendly gossip at your side, to whom you are indebted for these figures, tells you the news. You ask his name—Ulrich von Reichental, a burgher and canon of the Free City, specially deputed to look after the guests. He spends the moments of his leisure in making drawings of the coats of arms; as you walk along he points out the hundreds hanging outside the doors of the lodgings. When the Council is over, he means to publish his drawings and write his recollections. You take a hasty glance at his diary, and the note-books of his friends. He has found stabling for thirty thousand horses, and beds for thirty-six thousand strangers, who had to sleep as many as

twenty together. An heresiarch, he tells us,—this as you pass the house of Hus,—is 'a chest in which all heresies are shut up.' Evidently Reichental is no child of the New Learning, though he will point out to you the house where lodged one of its heralds, Manuel Chrysolore, whose tomb at Constance, in the former Dominican Church, with its Byzantine inscription, can still be seen by the tourist.

Some of the entries in these diaries are grim and curious. Five hundred bodies have been fished up from the river: it is an easy and silent way of getting rid of a foe. A burgher has sold his wife to one of Sigismund's suite for five hundred ducats, and with the proceeds has bought a new house. There are 1500 public women: Dacher counted up 700, and then begged to be excused the further task. 'Dicitur quod una meretrix lucrata est 800 florenos.'[1] You hand him back the book: you have no wish to read further. You see that Hus was right when he wrote

[1] For these curious details, mixed with items of prices,—'one white lily for a solidus,' etc.,—see Hardt, v. 52, 50; *Prol.*, 20. For the numbers, see lists from Dacher, Hardt, v. 12–52, with interesting collection of coats of arms. All such lists rest on the doubtful Reichental (Ed. Buck, 154–215), who gives 72,460, 'besides a countless number who rode in and out every day,' which vitiates the whole. See Wylie, *C.C.*, 46–8.

that it would take thirty years before Constance could 'be purged of the sins which this Council, most holy and infallible, has committed' (*Doc.*, 139).

But of the excellence of the police regulations not even Hus could have complained. None must shout or ride at night, under penalty of the hue and cry. Charges for bed, horse, and provisions have all been fixed by the burgomaster; and though the Council, with its vast numbers, sat in Constance for three years and six months, supplies throughout were abundant and cheap.[1] But the best testimony to the marvellous organisation is that in spite of the crowded combustible materials, open conflagrations of hate or patriotism were few. Ninety clerks alone were kept busy in settling disputes of rent or bargain, while eighty-three men were employed in selling Italian wine. If your funds run short, as the Council dragged along, there are seventy-four licensed money-lenders, forty-eight of whom are from Florence. Among these last we notice Cosimo de' Medici, who has come to represent his father. 'I think,' wrote Hus, when the Council was but in its second week, 'that if the Council is protracted,

[1] See the curious plates in Wolf's Reichental. Game makes a fair show, while of fishmongers there are four plates, a significant fact.

I shall be in lack of money.' Before the three years were out, lack of funds was a general complaint.[1]

The student would do well to recognise some of the chief actors in this memorable scene. Pope John we already know. Close by, in the Münstergasse, lodges Sigismund, to whose unwearied zeal the Council owes its all of success. Sigismund was the second son of the Emperor Charles IV., grandson, therefore, of the blind King John of Luxembourg and Bohemia killed at Crecy, whose plumes and motto, if we may trust tradition, are with us still. His eldest brother, Wenzel, is not here. Little love is lost between the childless drunkard and the restless intriguer, who has already supplanted him in the Empire, and who will in time succeed to his Bohemian kingdom, with which already, as we see from the appeal of Archbishop Zbinek, Sigismund at times interferes (*supra*, p. 154).

Sigismund, on his part, had won a kingdom by marrying the heiress of Hungary. His early years were full of inglorious adventure. We see him here and there, drinking hard, always borrowing; with glib tongue that captured all, especially the women; now dancing barefoot, in

[1] *Doc.*, 79, and for some price-lists, *Doc.*, 77.

breeches only, through the streets of Strassburg with the burghers wives; now fleeing down the Danube to Constantinople; now hung up for four-and-twenty hours by his heels 'to let the fever out'; always "riding and tossing upon the loud whirlwind of things, oftenest like an imponderous rag of conspicuous colour."[1] In Sept. 1396, though aided by the bravest knights of France and Germany, and 1000 lances from England, under the command of John Beaufort,[2] he had suffered a terrible defeat at Nicopolis from the Turks, under Bayezid; while in 1401 his rebel Magyars put him in prison. They found sufficient cause in his cruelties and lust. He had once called thirty of his disaffected nobles into his tent, and beheaded them one by one then and there. After his election (July 1411) as Emperor, in place of his drunken brother Wenzel, he settled down to a new start, "roamed about and talked eloquently aiming high and generally missing," always unconscious of the disparity between his intentions and resources. His character has been described for us by one of his contemporaries

[1] Carlyle, *Fred. Gt.*, i. 127 ff. The character of Sigismund in Lenfant, i. 48, is a panegyric. Vrie's panegyrics fill many pages: Hardt, i. (1) 24–5, 102–5, 218–20.

[2] Wylie, iii. 262.

who knew him well. 'Sigismund,' writes Æneas Sylvius,

'was tall, with bright eyes, broad forehead, pleasantly rosy cheeks, and a long thick beard. He had a large mind, and formed many plans, but was changeable. He was witty in conversation, given to wine and women, and thousands of love intrigues are laid to his charge. He was prone to anger but ready to forgive. He could not keep his money, but spent it lavishly. He made more promises than he kept, and often deceived' (Creighton, ii. 317).

"Few men," adds Creighton, "with such wise plans and such good intentions have so conspicuously failed."

Foiled in his effort to win back Milan for the Empire, Sigismund determined to gain renown in the Church. He had already given pledges of his orthodoxy by founding (1408) his order of the Golden Dragon to fight against all pagans, schismatics, and heretics. He would now heal the Schism, reunite the East and West, and lead Europe in a final crusade against the Turk. Christendom, in its disunion, hailed him as a second Messiah, while the Empire shot forth a fitful and deceptive gleam of its lost splendours. But the Ethiop could not change his skin. He was still, in spite of fitful gleams of a better purpose, the same "headlong, high-pacing, flimsy nature," whom his second wife, a Hungarian Messalina, helped to prepare

for the 'red-hot bath and bed of fire' that one of his courtiers saw waiting for him.[1] The manner of his death was characteristic. He had set out from Prague for Hungary, that he might support the claims to the succession of his son-in-law. But on reaching Znaim he realised that the end was near. So on Dec. 9, 1437, he put on his imperial robes and, with the crown on his head, attended High Mass. The service over, he ordered grave-clothes to be thrown over the imperial vesture; then taking his seat on the throne, awaited death. He passed away the same evening, and, according to his instructions, was left seated for three days, 'that men might see that the lord of all the world was dead and gone' (Creighton, ii. 316).

With the death of Sigismund the dreams and ambitions of his house vanished. In one thing he had his desire. The kingdoms of Bohemia and Hungary passed, through his only child, to his son-in-law, Albert of Austria, who was also elected Kaiser: after whom all the Kaisers were Hapsburgs—unless, indeed, we except the brief and shadowy rule of Charles VII. (1742–5) —until the dissolution of the Empire (1806). Thus the Hapsburgs took the place in Europe

[1] For Barbara, see Æn. Sylv. *Hist. Boh.*, c. 59, whose picture is, however, exaggerated. See Palacky, iii. (3) 282.

that the house of Luxembourg had tried, but failed, to obtain. But how near at one time the Luxembourgers were to success—except, indeed, for the fatal defect of their own characters—will be evident to the student who reads his history with a good atlas. Luxembourg, Brandenburg, Silesia, no small part of Saxony, Moravia, and Hungary, formed a powerful kingdom from the Baltic to the Adriatic, in which, if Sigismund could wisely have consolidated it, the non-German element would have been supreme. But the schemes of Charles IV., in spite of his Golden Bull and other efforts, had gone all agley.

Thus Sigismund strutted the stage of life, producing by his talk and restlessness no small impression. His name, indeed, "became a peg upon which collectors of anecdotes hung up" of their best.[1] Some of these are very good indeed. On one occasion he ennobled a doctor, who henceforth preferred to take his seat among the nobles rather than among the doctors. 'I could make a thousand noblemen a day,' mocked Sigismund, 'but in a thousand years I could not make one learned man.' This second Solomon, 'renowned for wisdom and learning,' 'expert in

[1] Lenfant, *C.C.*, i. 148, points out that these smart sayings are chiefly from the Commentary of Æneas Sylvius on the bon-mots of Alphonso of Aragon.

many tongues,' reminds us, in fact, in more ways than one, of our own James—James I., 6 as he has been wittily called. Both were "double-minded men, unstable in all their ways."[1]

In the Council itself lines of cleavage rapidly appeared or became more emphasised. Speaking broadly, we may discern an Italian or papal party, not necessarily pledged to John, but devoted to the supremacy of the Pope, above all of the Curia; a French or Gallican party, in modern phrase the centre or constitutionalists, pledged to the principles of the Gallican liberties, and to the limitation of papal autocracy by the authority of a General Council; and lastly, a German party,—the name itself significant of future movements,—whose schemes, however diverse, had the common stamp of the extremer wing. They also agreed in looking to Sigismund and the Empire as the hope of the future.

Of the three parties, the French, or Conciliar, speedily obtained the commanding influence, through its moderation, numbers, as well as the

[1] Sigismund is known as 'super grammaticam,' from the tale made familiar by Carlyle (*op. cit.* i. 134). The tale must be rejected as impossible (see Wylie, *C.C.*, 18–19). Sigismund is one of the few Kaisers who ever visited England. See *infra*, p. 241.

repute of its great University. Its leaders were Peter d'Ailli, bishop of Cambrai, and John Gerson. The former had already established a European fame as the 'eagle of France' and the 'hammer of heretics.' He was credited with universal knowledge. He had written, in 1411, a treatise on *The Reformation of the Calendar*.[1] Its chief defect was that it was before its age. From reading his work on geography, Columbus first gained the idea of a north-west passage to India.[2] As chancellor of the University of Paris, he had put himself at the head of the Conciliar movement, though with characteristic caution, and dislike of all attempts to hasten the issue by excess or coercion. His desire was to conciliate opposing interests; his danger, as Creighton points out, "a capacity for turning with the tide."[3] There are, he said, two extremes that must be shunned: the extreme of the Waldensians, who would not allow to clerics,

[1] Hardt, iii. 72 ff. Analysed in Lenfant, i. 695–700.

[2] So Tschackert (in Herzog).

[3] We see his principles clearly expressed in his treatise *De Ecclesiastica Potestate*, which he caused to be read in St. Paul's, Constance, on Oct. 1, 1416. See *infra*. D'Ailli's programme of reform for Constance (written at the end of 1411) may be best studied in his 'Capita Agendorum' (Hardt, i. 506–36), usually attributed to Zabarella, but probably by D'Ailli (see Finke, *F.Q.*, c. 7). Cf. also *supra*, p. 81, n. 2, latter part.

dominion or wealth, and the extreme of the Herodians, who imagined that the Messiah should be a temporal monarch. The plenitude of power lodged in the Pope, who was, however, subject to the right of the Council to examine whether he used it for the edification of the Church.[1] Thus 'a Council is above a Pope, and can even depose him.'[2] But no man can serve two masters; and on his appointment as cardinal, D'Ailli gradually drifted, during the Council itself, from a Reformer into an official reactionary. His patriotism led him to oppose the revolutionary designs of the English and Germans; at the same time he was probably not uninfluenced by the dream of obtaining the papal tiara. Disappointed in this last, he returned to France as legate, and died October 9, 1425.[3]

No less prominent than Gerson,[4] perhaps more potent in the real shaping of the Council's action, was the great English bishop, Robert Hallum,[5]—

[1] Hardt, vi. 15–78. Main positions on pp. 16, 55–64. Analysed Lenfant, i. 415–20. See also Hardt, iv. 909, ii. 201.

[2] Hardt, iv. 136. Cf. ii. 221, where D'Ailli takes refuge in Salus Ecclesiæ suprema lex.

[3] So Hardt, i. 480, on the evidence of his tomb at Cambrai. See also Ciac., ii. 801. Tschackert (in Herzog), Creighton, and others give Aug. 9, 1420, at Avignon, on which see Hardt, *loc. cit.*

[4] For Gerson, see *supra*, p. 61 ff.

[5] For Hallum, see Dr. Poole in *D.N.B.*; also Wylie, *Henry IV.*, passim.

so the name is spelt on the brass over his tomb at Constance,—whom Niem rightly calls 'very industrious and virtuous.' A chancellor of Oxford (1403–5), a doctor of canon law in 1405, he had been appointed by Innocent VII., during a visit to Rome,[1] Archbishop of York, in succession to Scrope, the 'martyred Saint Richard.' Henry IV. refused, however, to accept the nomination, and the see remained vacant for over two years. But in 1407 Gregory XII. and Henry agreed to a compromise, and Hallum, 'late Archbishop of York,' was appointed Bishop of Salisbury,[2] and consecrated at Siena. On his return to England the new bishop speedily became the leader in the councils of the National Church. In Jan. 1409 he was designated one of the representatives to the Council of Pisa. The impression he made is evidenced by his appointment, on June 5, 1411, as one of John's new cardinals, in the same consistory as D'Ailli and Zabarella. But Hallum never claimed or used the rank. At Constance he took his seat with the bishops. The explanation given by Italian writers is scarcely sufficient: 'According to custom,' we are

[1] Wals., ii. 273.

[2] See Gams, 197, or Eubel, 158. Bubwith was translated to Bath Oct. 7, 1407, and Hallum succeeded Oct. 23.

told, 'Hallum did not obtain the title, as he never came to Rome.' We prefer to see the reason in the reluctance of English kings to allow one of their bishops to wear the purple. Henry v. told his uncle, Beaufort, 'that he had as lief set his crown beside him as see him wear a cardinal's hat.'[1]

On Oct. 1, 1414, Hallum was appointed the head of the English mission to Constance. To meet the expenses, a tax was voted of twopence in the pound on all benefices. The deputation started toward the end of October, and slowly made its way down the Rhine. On Nov. 8 they were present at Aix-la-Chapelle at the coronation of Sigismund. At length, on Jan. 21, 1415,[2] they rode into Constance, attended by 700 mounted men. Hallum and Sigismund had

[1] Kingsford, *Henry V.*, 275. Cf. *supra*, Vol. i. p. 232 (case of Repyngdon). *Infra*, p. 255.

[2] Not Dec. 7, as *D.N.B.*, following Reichental, 46; Hardt, iv. 23, from Dacher. Hardt, iv. 20, is also wrong. In the Vatican MS. (Finke, *F.Q.*, 255–6) we read: 'On the morrow they visited our Lord Pope, and Salisbury made a beautiful speech' on reunion. For the names of the delegates, cf. *ibid.* 256, Wals., ii. 302, with Wylie, *C.C.*, 80. From Hardt, v. 97, we learn: 'In the present Council there were and are present of the English nation, thanks be to God, 10 bishops, 7 abbots, 1 friar, 16 masters in theology, 11 doctors in both laws, 25 graduates. And besides these, of ecclesiastical persons sixty and more. And others, scholars of lesser count, more than 100.' But the bishops were certainly not all there together.

already met, and probably arranged their plans. From the first the bishop ranged the English on the side of the German Reformers. He had brought with him a treatise of Richard Ullerston, written at his request, entitled *Petitiones quoad Reformationem Ecclesiæ Militantis*,[1] the principles of which he pressed on the Council. He urged the resignation of John, whom he did not scruple to rebuke in public session in his famous speech, 'Rogo dignum esse Johannem papam.'[2] The Pope, in fact, expressly attributed his later disasters to Hallum's influence. In the trial of Hus he seems to have taken but little interest, but was the leader of those who, after the deposition of John, pressed for steps of reform. To this party his premature death at Gottlieben, 'about eight o'clock at night,'[3] on Sept. 4, 1418, was an irreparable disaster. On Sept. 13 he

[1] Printed in Hardt, i. 1128–71. Nothing striking in it.

[2] Hardt, iv. 1418. Hallum and John came to 'words' over the closing of the gates on March 14 (*F.Q.*, 263).

[3] Not Sept. 7, as Creighton, ii. 93. See Finke, *F.Q.*, 220. Hardt, iv. 44, iv. 1414, 'Rupertus Alanus Archiepiscopus Sarisburiensis strenuus Reformationis propugnator, cujus jussu Rupertus Ulleston, Theologus Anglus, nobile opus scripserat, in hoc concilio multis lectum, *Petitiones pro Ecclesia Reformanda* magno concilii et Ecclesiæ damno obiit Gotlebiæ, Sept. 4.' 'The Archbishop of Salisbury' was often confused with Salzburg, *e.g.* Reichental, 46, 'Lord John, Archbishop of Salisbury, entered with 63 horses.'

was buried in the cathedral 'cum insigniis Archepiscopalibus' at the foot of the steps leading to the high altar, in the presence of Sigismund and the whole Council. By his zeal, courage, and character he had won the esteem of all, even of those who, as Fillastre, resented his commanding influence,[1]—'haughty speech, mingled with threats,'—or detected his hand in every plot, however wild. The cardinal names him as the leader of those 'who were notorious enemies of the Roman Church and Curia,' and for whose removal from office the College pleaded but a month before Hallum's decease.[2]

II

With the arrival of Sigismund, delegates poured into Constance, some, like the Archbishop of Mainz and the English, attended by 800 horsemen. Business began to be taken up in earnest. At first all seemed to turn out as

[1] Finke, 204. Unde in isto concilio fuit publice dictum, quod Mars regebat concilium, exponendo Mars per litteras: M, Mediolanensis; A, Anthiocenus; R, Rigonsis; S, Sarisburiensis; cf. *ibid.* 178, 196, 203, 212, 214, 216, and Hardt, iv. 129. Of the four, the Frenchman Cramaud, the patriarch of Antioch, was the most influential, next to Hallum. John bewailed (Hardt, ii. 256) how Sigismund 'unum erexit idolum,' and Fillastre calls him 'minister omnium malorum' (*F.Q.*, 222). See also Finke, *ibid.* 15.

[2] *F.Q.*, 207, 217.

Gerson and the Conciliarists desired. The Curialists had been anxious to take first the matters of faith, the Bohemian heresy,[1] Gregory XII., Benedict XIII., and certain clauses which would have guarded the property and enhanced the rights of the cardinals. They would see to it that little time should be left for the awkward subject of reform, or the dangerous doctrine of the superiority of General Council to Pope. (Dec. 7). But the French cardinals, D'Ailli and Fillastre, with the approval of Sigismund[2] and the English, supported, on their arrival (Feb. 18),[3] by Gerson and the deputies of Paris, persuaded the Council to seek first the union of the Church.[4] The accomplishment of this, Fillastre argued, could be brought about in but one way. All three popes, John included,—against whom, 'in the Council itself, an Italian was already secretly circulating a memoir exposing all his mortal sins,'[5]—must equally resign. John, it was true, was a lawful pope, elected through a

[1] So, also, the Englishman Thomas Pelthon desired to begin with Wyclif 'while the English delegates are on the way' (*F.Q.*, 251).

[2] Hardt, ii. 236 (Feb. 24); cf. *F.Q.*, 257.

[3] So Hardt, iv. 43. But in Finke, *F.Q.*, 259, Feb. 26.

[4] Feb. 15, then 21 and 28. Finke, *F.Q.*, 166, 257; Lab., xvi. 43–6, and for the French, Hardt, iv. 130 (letter to Charles VI.).

[5] Niem in *Vita*, Hardt, ii. 391.

Council whose decisions it would be dangerous to call in question. But the good Shepherd had laid down His life for the sheep;[1] how much more did it behove a pope to lay aside his honours for the good of the Church![2]

The ambition of John, whose spies were everywhere,[3] lay in other directions than this imitation of Christ. He was determined that he would not go. So he created fifty new Italian bishops, on whose votes he could count. The Reformers swept off these pawns by a counter move. The object, they said, in every Council was to get at the mind of the Christian community. They claimed, therefore, that all doctors of theology and secular princes should have a vote: at one stroke thus adding to their side over three hundred on whom they could depend. Some pleaded for an even more democratic conception of the Church, and demanded the vote for all clerics. 'An ignorant king or bishop,' argued Fillastre, 'is no better than a crowned ass.'[4]

[1] Lascher, bishop-elect of Posen, rubbed this in in a sermon he preached before John (Jan. 15, 1415, Lab., xvi. 1300–4).

[2] Finke, *F. Q.*, 166–7; Hardt, iv. 24, 108; for D'Ailli's scheme, ii. 194–203; and for Fillastre's, ii. 208–13. From *F. Q.*, 165, we find that the unsigned paper in Hardt, ii. 222, was also by Fillastre. For D'Ailli's pamphlets, etc., at Constance, see Finke, *F. Q.*, c. 7.

[3] Niem in *Vita*, Hardt, ii. 390.

[4] See Fillastre's interesting paper, Hardt, ii. 225–30, and

The Pope was in check; checkmate speedily followed. As we have seen, the English prelates and doctors were few, the Italians many. So on the motion of Hallum, supported by Sigismund (Feb. 7), it was determined, or rather the custom obtained without any formal decision,[1] of voting by nations,—the four nations of French, Italians, Germans (including Poles, Hungarians, Danes, Scandinavians), and English,—the vote of each to be equal. The reader will note the importance thus added to the English, whose twelve or twenty deputies, including Scots, thus balanced the two or three hundred delegates of

John's complaints, ii. 256. On the whole subject of the extension of the voting, see Finke, *F.Q.*, 29–32. The matter would seem to have been introduced by the Germans; see Hardt, i., Prolog. p. 34, last clause, really a separate paper, on which see Finke, *F.Q.*, 30 n.

[1] There was no formal decision of the Council on the matter. See Finke, *F.Q.*, 31–5; Creighton, i. 319 n.; and especially the Vatican MS. in Finke, *F.Q.*, 256–7; and cf. *ibid.* 166, Hardt, ii. 231. In Hardt, iv. 130, the representatives of Paris University expressly state that there was no decree. D'Ailli (Hardt, i. 431) argued against the arrangement (Nov. 1, 1416): 'Talis modus dividendi magis est secularis quam ecclesiasticus et ad contentiones de majoritate vel superioritate dispositivus. Magis videtur esse procedendum per provincias ecclesiastico more distinctas.' His objection proved correct; cf. Fillastre, *F.Q.*, 180, and *infra*, p. 237. On March 17, 1415, an attempt was made to carry out this idea of provinces (*F.Q.*, 264).

France or Italy.[1] The first result of the new organisation, after the manner of the universities, was the decision that John must abdicate (Feb. 16).[2] The Pope's prophecy was fulfilled—Constance was proving a trap for foxes. But John's vulpine resources were not yet exhausted. On March 1 he took a solemn oath in the cathedral to 'give peace to the Church by way of simple cession of the Papacy,' as soon as Gregory and Benedict would do the same. This oath he confirmed the following day in a General Session of the Council—the second only yet held.[3] The assembled prelates and doctors wept for joy. Sigismund laid aside his crown and kissed the Pope's foot. When the rejoicings were over, John betrayed his hand. He had a plan whereby he could turn their mirth into mourning. He hinted that to expedite the negotiations with Gregory and Benedict, the Council should be transferred to some other place, preferably Nice.[4] The Council met the suggestion with the demand,

'on the part of the three nations, French, German, and English, that he would consent to appoint proctors, whom the

[1] This was pointed out by John himself in the remarkable document he sent on March 23 to the King of France and Duke of Orleans (Lab., xvi. 805–9; Hardt, ii. 253–64).

[2] Hardt, ii. 230; Lab., xvi. 44; *F.Q.*, 258.

[3] Hardt, iv. 45–46, ii. 234–41; Lab., xvi. 91.

[4] *F.Q.*, 263.

Council should nominate, that they might effect his resignation. Secondly, that this Council shall not be dissolved until the peace and reform of the Church be accomplished. Third, that no one should leave the Council without permission. . . . The intention was to appoint Sigismund as his proctor' (*F.Q.*, 168).

To this idea of a proctor John could not yield.[1] His cause would be ruined. His hopes were raised for a moment by a sharp quarrel between the French and Sigismund. The German and English had determined to force the Pope to appoint proctors. The French appointed a later day (March 19) for their decision. When they met, they found that 'Sigismund had come first, with many dukes, margraves, and barons. The hall was so full that many bishops had to descend to the lowest seats.' But the French refused to proceed until the Germans had withdrawn. Sigismund, in a temper, replied that the greater part of those present were his subjects, from Savoy and Provence. 'Now,' he added, 'it will be seen who is for union, and who is faithful to the Roman Empire.' Unhappily for John, the quarrel was patched up.[2]

John realised that his last throw must be made. He would leave Constance, the air of

[1] For his ambiguous answers of March 16, see Lab., xvi. 54.

[2] *F.Q.*, 169, espec. Vat. MS., *ibid.* 264 5; cf. Hardt, iv. 58, from Cerretanus.

which he discovered to be unhealthy, and so, in spite of an ambiguous promise, dissolve the Council. Flight was not easy, for Sigismund, in nowise blinded by the Pope's gift of the Golden Rose (March 10), or by his offer of a loan of 200,000 florins,[1] had penetrated his design and closed the gates.[2] On the remonstrance of the Council they were reopened, but 2000 police patrolled the streets. To throw the Emperor off his guard, John took to his bed,[3] while all Constance poured out to see a tournament for fifty gold rings, got up for the purpose by the Pope's ally, Frederic of Austria. On returning, the Council discovered that the Pope had escaped 'about vespers,' 'mounted on a sorry nag,' 'by the Swiss gate,' 'in the darkness of a foggy night,' 'in an indecent disguised lay-dress.'[4] On his way he was joined by the Duke. Two days later the Council received letters from him. 'By the grace of God,' he wrote, 'I have arrived at Schaffhausen,'—a city then within the domains

[1] See Creighton, i. 326, n. 2, for this incident.

[2] March 14. *F.Q.*, 168, 261–3; Hardt, ii. 259; Lab., xvi. 810. The Golden Rose made a great impression on Reichental. See the four plates in Wolf.

[3] Niem in *Vita* (Hardt, ii. 395–8) gives details of a visit of Sigismund to John.

[4] For the flight of the Pope and its uncertain date, see Appendix M, p. 360.

of Austria,—'where I enjoy liberty and breathe air suited to my health. I have come hither not to dispense myself from my promise of abdicating the Papacy, but that I may execute it with greater freedom.'[1] He added, in a further communication, nailed upon the doors of the cathedral, that all officers of the Curia must join him within a week, under pain of excommunication.[2] This was his answer to the deputation sent on the 22nd by the Curia, beseeching him 'to persevere in the proposed cession, the appointment of proctors, and the other matters useful for the Council and for union.'[3]

The Pope's daring, which only the issue showed to be a fatal blunder, almost succeeded. Many of the cardinals, irritated by the antagonism to them displayed in the Council, felt bound to stand by their head; seven of them rode off at once to Schaffhausen, among them the future Martin v.[4] Their speedy return (April 10) was attributed rather to the Pope's execrable kitchen, and John's further flight to Laufenburg (March 29) and Freiburg, — his escape to Italy was

[1] Hardt, ii. 252. Written March 21.

[2] Hardt, ii. 253, 399; Lab., xvi. 59, on March 23. On the same day he sent off the important paper *Informationes Pape* to France (Lab., xvi. 805; Hardt, ii. 253–64; text very corrupt).

[3] *F.Q.*, 170; cf. Hardt, iv. 66, from Cerretanus.

[4] *F.Q.*, 170. Colonna returned May 4 (Hardt, iv. 158).

blocked,—than to more enlightened views. Fillastre, however, gives another version, probably that of the penitent wanderers themselves——

'On Thursday, the evening of our Lord's Supper (eve of Good Friday, March 28), just as the Pope and the seven cardinals were setting out for church, the Pope was informed that the King of the Romans had placed the Duke of Austria under a ban. It was true. When the Pope heard it, the Pope retired, without any service. On Good Friday, without any service in a church (I know not if he said prayers in private), the Pope departed with the Duke, but without any cardinal. Not even his own nephew would accompany him. For they were frightened of being thrown into prison by the Duke, whose intention it was to get back from the Pope and cardinals all losses he might sustain through the war.'[1]

Meanwhile at Constance all was suspense and confusion, only the worse confounded by endless sermons and pamphlets, amidst which, on Easter Eve (March 30), the memorable fourth session of the Council was held. The attendance was small;[2] D'Ailli was purposely absent; Fillastre and Zabarella took the lead, hoping thereby to save the Council from more revolutionary counsels. They read the proposals: 'This Synod, lawfully assembled in the Holy Ghost, forming a General Council, has its power immediately from Christ, and all men, even the Pope, are bound to obey it in matters pertaining to the faith and the extirpa-

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 170.

[2] 'Ultra ducenti,' Lab., xvi. 66. Sigismund was there.

tion of the present Schism.' The decree ran on: 'and general reformation of the Church of God in head and members.'[1] These last words Zabarella refused to read: they touched too deeply the interests of the cardinals. To the first part, the supremacy of a Council over the Pope, the Curia were not unwilling to agree, for they had limited it by the saving clause 'for the present Schism.' Such limitation was no part of the Council's programme. The unofficial section, at anyrate, were thinking of the argument of Gerson, that the Church was wiser and worthier than any Pope, and as such could correct or even depose him.[2]

After much discussion, and no small outblaze of anger against the cardinals, the settlement of the question was postponed for a week. But on April 6th the decrees were re-read, and approved in a fifth session. 'The majority of the cardinals,' says Fillastre, 'at first raised objections to being present. But afterwards all except the sick came to the session. The decrees were read

[1] On these words, see Lab., xvi. 67 n.; Gobelin Persona, *Cosmod.*, vi. 94.

[2] Hardt, ii. 275–80; cf. the opinion of Dietrich von Münster, *F.Q.*, 301–3. For the sessions of March 30 and April 6, see Hardt, iv. 86–90, 96–99; Lab., xvi. 66 ff.; and Finke, *F.Q.*, 171. For Gerson's views, see his sermon of July 21, 1415; *Op.*, ii. 273–80; Hardt, ii. 471–85.

by the bishop-elect of Posen, for Zabarella still refused.' A clause was added (which led from the first to acres of controversy), asserting that the superiority of a Council over the Pope applied 'to every other Council General legitimately assembled.'[1] Some of the Reformers would have gone further, and asserted the Council's independence of the cardinals. A proposal, emanating, it would seem, from Dietrich of Niem,[2] was actually made to exclude the College from the Council's sittings, on the plea that their actions were really being tried; 'they ought not, therefore, to be the judges in their own case.' The motion failed, or rather an amendment was passed that the cardinals should have no vote apart from their respective nations.[3] This resolution by resolution speedily became waste-paper. A more effective method was 'to hand them the resolutions agreed by the nations so short a time before the session that they had no opportunity of sufficiently discussing them. Truly,' moans Fillastre, 'cardinals are held in great contempt.'

[1] Lab., xvi. 73; Hardt, iv. 98. See Appendix N, p. 362.

[2] Hardt, ii. 285–8; Lab., xvi. 815, where it is simply stated as 'per prelatum.' Date April 17 (Gobelin, *Cosm.*, vi. 340). In Hardt, iv. 120–1, it is attributed to Benedict Gentian of Paris. See Finke, *F.Q.*, 88–90.

[3] *F.Q.*, 175; Hardt, iv. 140, from Schelstret. May 2, in congregation only.

He especially singles out the Germans and English as 'always frightened lest the cardinals should have any influence.'[1]

This attack on the cardinals was to some extent the reply to a counter attack by the cardinals on the Council. On April 18 the Curia laid before the Council a series of propositions affirming the headship of the Roman Church, and its supremacy, derived direct from God, over both the Universal Church and a General Council. Without the assent of the Roman Church,—that is, of the Pope, or in his absence the cardinals, —nothing was valid.[2] The theologians present were asked by the Council to answer the document clause by clause. This, we see, they were unable to do without going further into revolutionary principles than they were prepared. Their reply is of importance as showing the real weakness of the Conciliar position. The Reformers at Constance were attempting the im-

[1] *F.Q.*, 175, 181 ; cf. 170, 171.

[2] Absque ejus autoritate non dicitur concilium, sed conventiculum vel conciliabulum.' See the interesting document, Hardt, ii. 286–96 ; Lab., xvi. 816–21, the authorship of which is examined in Finke, *F.Q.*, 93–102. Its date is fixed by the 'conclusio' on p. 291. How little the Council dare carry out their own principles is seen by their playing with the 5th conclusion (p. 290). See also Creighton, i. 338 n. For once the Patriarch of Antioch was on the side of the cardinals. See his paper, Hardt, ii. 295–99 ; Lab., xvi. 821–3.

possible. They sought to establish a new representative government of the Church without disturbing its old autocratic foundations. All things were to remain as they were, only with new additions. But the new cloth could not thus be patched on to the old garment. The papal autocracy was too deeply woven into the whole fabric of the law thus easily to be eliminated by an assembly of cautious canonists.

All things seemed ripe for the Council ending in a struggle between the cardinals and Reformers, from which John would have emerged triumphant. That the Council was saved must be put down to the energy of Sigismund, the Pope's fatal want of confidence in himself, and the lack of union among the cardinals themselves, which the Pope's flight had revealed.[1] Frederic was placed under the ban of the Empire and the curse of Judas. The Swiss, not indifferent, in spite of their present truce, to the repayment of old scores, were persuaded to overrun his domains.[2] Engagements, they were informed, need not be considered binding if made with excommunicated men. Their perfidy was not without reward. Thurgau, Aargau, and the

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 170. March 27. Note: 'Fuitque facta requesta regi ut guerram non moveret duci Austriæ.'

[2] Niem, *Vita*, Hardt, ii. 406; Hardt, iv. 163.

Sundgau were lost to the House of Austria for ever; and Frederic, to save his remaining fiefs, consented to surrender the Pope (May 5). Four days later 'the burggrave Frederic of Nuremberg was sent to Freiburg to bring him back.' All the efforts of John to escape from Breisach and Freiburg had ended in failure. He was too fat not to be recognised in his 'peasant's smock,' mounted 'on a small black horse.'[1] Like Charles I. of England, in a similar case, he tried every device except the plain dealing which alone could have saved him. When at last he consented to the appointment of D'Ailli, Zabarella, and Fillastre as his proctors, he found it was too late.[2] Fillastre, in fact, declined to act.[3]

The Council was now supreme. John was formally cited at the city gates,—'the Swiss Gate, the same by which the said John had fled,'[4]—and, after the usual delay, the judgment was set. The proceedings began with a heated controversy as to who should go to the doors of the cathedral to see if by chance the Pope was there.[5] When

[1] Full account of the Pope's moves in Fillastre, who was sent by the Council to negotiate with him. Finke, *F.Q.*, 171–6.

[2] Cf. Lab., xvi. 103–9. Appointed April 17, Lab., xvi. 94.

[3] *F.Q.*, 176. May 13.

[4] Hardt, iv. 157, 174. May 4.

[5] See the amusing story, Finke, *F.Q.*, 176–7. Hardt, iv. 181, 195. May 13 and 14.

that was settled, John was declared suspended from his offices,[1] while commissioners were appointed to examine the charges against him. As the result of their labours, they presented a schedule under seventy-two heads,—reduced, 'on account of the honour of the Apostolic See,' or, as Fillastre states, 'for lack of agreement,' to fifty-four,—each 'proved by many irreproachable witnesses.' The schedule is full of the darkest charges, ranging from unnatural crimes down to his robbing Bolognese professors of their stipends, and the sale to the Florentines, 'for the sum of 500 ducats, of the head of John the Baptist.' This head, we are informed, 'would have been delivered had not the saint revealed the matter to the Romans.' The majority of the charges, especially in matters of simony, are probably true; some are doubtful, others palpably false. Of one thing only may we be confident: the witness they bear, if true, to the low level of ecclesiastical life; if false, to the worse than contempt in which a vicar of Christ could be held.[2]

Whether exaggerations or not, John, a prisoner now at Radolfzell, under a Hungarian guard,[3] was

[1] Hardt, iv. 183–6.

[2] See Appendix C for an examination of these charges.

[3] See the report, Lab., xvi. 175.

lost. On May 29, in spite of his tears and begging letter to Sigismund,[1] 'Our Lord Pope John' was deposed as 'unworthy, useless, and harmful, 'vas omnium peccatorum.'[2] The papal arms were removed from his dwelling, and he himself, after solemnly agreeing to his own deposition,[3] was sent, 'with only a cook,' to Gottlieben (June 3).[4] There, for a few days, he was a fellow-prisoner with John Hus.[5] A few months later he was handed over, for greater security, to the Elector Palatine, and removed first to Heidelberg, then to Mannheim. There he employed his time in writing verses—at any-rate, such were fathered upon him—upon the transitory nature of earthly glory:

> 'Omnibus ex terris aurum mihi sponte ferebant:
> Sed nec gaza jurat; nec quis amicus adest.'[6]

A year ago he had ridden into Constance, six hundred mules carrying his baggage.[7] Now he is

[1] Lab. xvi. 194; Hardt, iv. 259; Niem, *Vita*, ii. 408; Vrie in Hardt, i. (1) 196, show the sensation this humiliation made.

[2] Hardt, iv. 197. For the decree, *ibid.* iv. 280; Lab., xvi. 212.

[3] May 31. Hardt, iv. 286, 291–5; Lab., xvi. 215.

[4] Hardt, iv. 296–7.

[5] Pal. *Doc.*, 255, 541. Hus was confined in the Western Tower from March 24th to June 5th; the Pope in the Eastern.

[6] Hardt, iv. 298–9.

[7] Reichental 155.

reduced to making his wants known by signs : not an Italian in the castle, and of German he knows not a word. Some months afterwards (1318), the Florentines—with whom John had always been on good terms—procured his release from the Elector, who had quarrelled with Sigismund, for 38,500 ducats. A little later, at Florence, as Fillastre tells us, 'clad only in doctor's robes,' 'he humbled himself at his successor's feet,' 'approved and ratified his renunciation of the Papacy, and recognised Martin as the true Pope. So humbly did he act, that scarcely anyone who heard his words was able to restrain his tears.'[1] Martin accordingly created him Bishop of Tusculum and Cardinal of Florence (June 1419). He died within a few months of regaining his honours (Dec. 22, 1419), and was buried, at the expense of Cosimo dei Medici, in the famous Baptistery, to the right of the high altar. There lies 'the body of Baldassare Cossa, John XXIII., once Pope,' under one of Donatello's masterpieces.[2] There, like the bishop in St. Praxed's, he can

> 'hear the blessed mutter of the mass,
> And see God made and eaten all day long,
> And feel the steady candle-flame, and taste
> Good, strong, thick, stupefying incense-smoke.'

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 242 ; Hardt, iv. 299.

[2] For his tomb, Hardt, iv. 28 ; Ciac., ii. 795.

In the eyes of Fillastre and others nothing became him like his last months. 'Peace be with his soul,'—with these words the cardinal concludes his Journal,—for by his pious end 'he mightily strengthened the union of the Church.'

Gregory and Benedict still remained to be dealt with, if the Council would avoid the mistake of Pisa. Gregory was living under the protection of the noble Charles di Malatesta. After much persuasion and some friction, Gregory issued a Bull (March 13)[1] authorising Malatesta to proceed to Constance and act for him. He saved his dignity by accrediting his proctor neither to the Council, which he still refused to recognise, nor to John, but to Sigismund.[2] On June 15, 1415, Malatesta arrived in Constance. By his skill, aided by the general weariness and excessive heat, he gained all he desired. On July 4th the Council met for its fourteenth session, and listened to a Bull of Gregory con-

[1] So *F.Q.*, 224. But Lab., xvi. 229, as March 10. He had previously, in an undated Bull, appointed Sigismund his proctor. See Finke, *F.Q.*, 19 n.

[2] Lab., xvi. 221; Hardt, iv. 370. Cf. 'congregationem ipsam, in quantum per dictam serenitatam regiam et non Baltassarem . . . vocatam.' Vrie (Hardt, i. (1) 163–70) gives an account of these negotiations, and waxes eloquent over Gregory's renunciation: 'Angelus est nomen ejus,' etc.

voking and then approving the assembly, with all its transactions. It was further agreed that there should be a fusion of the cardinals of John and Gregory. Though Gregory should be considered the head of the Council, Sigismund alone should act as President until after the resignation of the Pope. Gregory's resignation was then proclaimed.[1] An ample maintenance was assigned to him as Cardinal of Porto, in the Marches of Ancona. This, however, he did not live to enjoy. He died on Oct. 19, 1417, and is buried in the Cathedral of Recenati.[2] His last words are, perhaps, a fair summary of his career and character: 'I have not understood the world, and the world has not understood me.'

The dealings with Benedict were left to the diplomatic skill of Sigismund. On July 19th the Emperor set out for Perpignan. Thither also, towards the end of September, came Benedict, with his cardinals. The result was the

[1] Fillastre was unfortunately ill at this time. We therefore lack his assistance in explaining the full significance of this affair with Gregory. Pastor (i. 201), following the canonist Phillips, claims that it shows that Gregory was still the real Pope, and that the decisions of Pisa were valueless. On reading the accounts (Lab., xvi. 221–40; Hardt. iv. 346–82) it seems clear that the Council, while guarding itself, gave Pisa away.

[2] Tomb in Hardt, iv. 239; Ciac., ii. 760.

agreement of Narbonne,[1] whereby the prelates of Benedict's obedience—Benedict himself would be no party to it—should summon the Council of Constance to a meeting at Constance, while the Council was to summon the prelates. The joint assembly would then proceed to the trial and deposition of Benedict, and the election of a new Pope. Neither entreaties nor menaces, neither the defection of the Spaniards nor the anathemas of the joint Council,—Benedict, after many delays, was solemnly deposed July 26, 1417,[2]—were able to move the aged Peter de Luna. He was determined, come what may, to die as he had lived—a Pope. Deserted by all, even by Vincent Ferrer, he fled to the family fortress to which his papal realm was restricted. There, in the weird St. Michael's Mount of Spain, Peniscola, which rises sheer out of the blue Mediterranean, Benedict XIII. for eight years longer still held his court, a new *Athanasius contra mundum.* 'This,' he cried, grasping the arm of his papal chair, 'this is the ark of Noah.' 'The Church,' he added, 'is not at Constance, but

[1] The negotiations at length in Hardt, ii. pt. 18. For the treaty itself, Dec. 13, 1415, see Hardt, ii. 540–54; Lab., xvi. 1029–33. There are some new documents in Finke, *F.Q.*, 322–37.

[2] Hardt, iv. 1367; Mansi, xxvii. 1140.

at Peniscola.'[1] With his last breath he bade his two comrades keep up the true succession against his rival in the Vatican. His indomitable courage was worthy of a better cause. But the age was against him, and summed up a character which, under other circumstances, it might have reverenced as heroic, in the bitter words of Vrie: 'Benedictus vocatus est, sed re ipsa verissime Maledictus.'[2]

III

To moderate men the deposition of John seemed a revolution. The Council felt it was necessary to reassure them. The condemnation of Wyclif, Hus, and Jerome—to which we shall return—was intended as a demonstration to Europe that complete orthodoxy could go hand in hand with revolutionary zeal, and that their supreme care was the unity of the Church. Not until, by the burning of the Bohemians, they had supplied hostages to Europe for their faith, did the Council feel that they could safely proceed to measures of Church reform, the need of which was dwelt

[1] Hardt, iv. 1127; Lab., xvi. 1039–41, from the letter of Lambert Stock (Jan. 22, 1418), who, 'with Master Bernard, an Englishman, entered Peniscola without a safe-conduct,' in spite of the fact that 'Benedict's soldiers are desperate men' (Hardt, iv. 1124, 1129).

[2] Hardt, i. (1) 187; cf. the bitter curses, *ibid.* 206–10.

on, sometimes with much boldness, in innumerable sermons and pamphlets.[1] But as soon as Hus was burnt, a Commission of eight deputies from each nation was appointed, under the lead of D'Ailli, to prepare a scheme (July 14, 1415).[2] At the same time, to keep the cardinals in check, and resist their claim that in the absence of a Pope they were the rulers of the Church, a standing committee of deputies—'qui generales vocabantur'—was appointed, under the lead of Cramaud (Antioch) and Hallum. This body at once reserved for the Council itself the sole right of issuing Bulls. These, the nations determined, must be signed by the four presidents of the nations ('Mars').[3]

Of grievances to be remedied there was no lack. The festering sores of the Church gaped wide, nor were they such as could be mollified with oil. But where to begin—with the head

[1] Examples in Lenfant, i. 351 ff., from Hardt. See also Finke, *F.Q.*, c. 9.

[2] This is the committee of which we have the report in Hardt, i. 583–644; Lab., xvi. 1042–79. On the number of the committee, see Creighton, ii. 67 n. This reform programme is chiefly financial, dealing with the transactions of the Curia and Papacy. It lays down (i. 594–7) that a Pope can be deposed by a General Council for other crimes than heresy. The question of annates was not touched, as it chiefly affected the French. See *infra*, p. 243.

[3] Fillastre in *F.Q.*, 178. See Finke, *F.Q.*, 36–7.

or in the members? The bishops were in the majority, and the abuses and exactions of Rome were notorious; on the other hand, the cardinals, while willing to aid in a reformation of the episcopacy, were determined that nothing should be done which should retrench their income or powers, or reduce the future Pope to a penniless figure-head. Each party was anxious to reform the other, but careful to suffer no interference with its own irregularities. Naturally reform proved to be a Tower of Babel. "Opinions were as numerous and conflicting as the nationalities." 'The reform,' wrote a German deputy, 'which one nation desires, another rejects,' while the Council had decided that 'nothing should be done without unanimity.' 'A month has gone by, it is already the first of October, and nothing is done,' writes Fillastre in despair. A year later he wrote almost the same words: 'One nation wants one thing, another another, so there is much toil and little gained.'[1] But Fillastre himself was fast losing his interest in reform. His protest is no longer against 'crowned asses'; he complains rather of 'the many expenses to which the cardinals are put, the revenues they have lost, the insults, public

[1] Pastor, i. 205–6; Finke, *F.Q.*, 180, 181, 227. The effort to obtain that the vote of three nations out of four should suffice had failed.

and private, to which they were subjected.' Mud-throwing, in fact, was general. Not even Gerson and D'Ailli were safe from charges of heresy.

The Curialists knew that if they could divide, they would rule. So, to save themselves, they gladly fomented the political animosities—the struggle of France and England, Burgundians and Armagnacs, the quarrel of Poland with the Teutonic Knights—which were fast breaking up the unity of the Council. In this struggle of politics it were difficult to say which party were the aggressors. The Orleanists, however, were the more prominent. They persuaded Gerson to press before the Council the condemnation of John Petit, a doctor of Paris, who had defended, in a series of ingenious but anarchical sophistries (1408), the murder by Burgundy of the Duke of Orleans.[1] The Burgundians retorted by extracting twenty-five articles from Gerson's writings which they declared to be heretical.[2] The Orleanists, by the conquests of Henry v. now become the national party, met the victory of Agincourt (Oct. 25, 1415) by persuading the Aragonese to dispute the right of the English to sign 'placet' before

[1] On this matter of Petit, see Appendix P, p. 363.

[2] *Gers. Opera*, v. 439–44, with Gerson's answers, 445–50. Both are interesting.

themselves, and afterwards their right to be counted as a nation at all (Dec. 16, 1416). 'When an English delegate rose to reply, there was such a shouting and stamping that he could not be heard.' Led on by D'Ailli, 'acting for the French King, and having a general mandate from him,' the Orleanists again brought the matter before the Council.[1] They pointed out that by the Bull, *Vas Electionis*, of Benedict XII. that island had been ruled to be part of Germany; let the Council return to the old ways. 'In the Roman Church there are 735 dioceses, besides cardinals, and of all these England does not possess 25. Wherefore it is absurd that they should represent a fourth or fifth part of a General Council.' Their history was scarcely up to date. 'Wales,' they said, 'does not obey the English King.' They forgot the Welsh archers who had completed their ruin at Crecy and Agincourt. The English retorted, in defence of their claims, by presenting (March 31) a schedule of statistics, then as now our national foible. These tables proved that the sixty islands of the Orkneys

[1] First on Nov. 5, 1416 (Finke, *F.Q.*, 182), then on Dec. 16, 1416 (*ibid.* 184), March 3, 1417 (*ibid.* 190). The matter is always arising in Fillastre, who gives great prominence to these rivalries, showing their importance in the settlement. In Rymer, ix. 439–42, we have a report of the matter sent (March 14, 1417) to Henry V. by 'R. A.' (*i.e.* Appleton).

were in themselves larger than France. The parish churches of England were 52,000, a thousand for every week of the year; whereas in the whole of France there were but 6000: of Anglican dioceses there were one hundred and ten; the French, we note, had claimed one hundred and one. Let the Council remember that only by a forty days' journey could men travel the length of Britain: a statement that we may well believe when we remember the then state of our roads. Finally, they made much of 'the Holy Helen, with her son Constantine the Great, born in the royal city of York,' who 'first gave licence to Christians to hold a General Council.' 'Whence, then,' they conclude,

'this unequal comparison of the kingdom of France with England. It is like the work of those who, for the sake of self-glory, paint the city of Paris as occupying more space on the map of the world than the whole realm of England.'[1]

These imaginary figures, significantly enough, were not disputed. The British were then, as now, divided from the rest of the world. Few indeed of the Council had penetrated into these northern wilds; so, as there was none to gainsay, unblushing assertion was justified of her children,

[1] Hardt, iv. 53–103. Copied out by Wyngfield (*infra*, p. 257), 'per fidos notarios ad verbum.' Wyngfield was deceived. They copied it out very badly.

and the Council passed on to other business. The same struggle of nationalism was exhibited on the formation (Oct. 15, 1416) of a fifth nation, the Spanish. The Portuguese, who had joined the Council with Aragon and Castile, claimed, though in vain, that they were a nation by themselves. In these outbursts of national temper the cardinals saw their plan of salvation. Sigismund, who might have acted as mediator, had thrown away his influence by his journey to London,[1] and definite alliance at Canterbury with Henry v., at the very time when his presence and impartiality at Constance were most needed.

On Jan. 27, 1417, Sigismund returned from England, well pleased with his diplomacy and its results, prepared to attempt fresh triumphs. He had undertaken to finish the Council and take the field with Henry v. in the early summer against the French. Nor was he careful to conceal his new alliance. He re-entered Constance wearing the collar of the Garter round his neck, 'a glad sight to all Englishmen to see.' Nevertheless, the Council welcomed him with every appearance of unanimity. 'Cardinals and all the nations poured out over Rhine Bridge to meet him.' Foremost amongst them, wrote John

[1] May 3, 1416. Treaty of Canterbury, Aug. 15. Rymer, ix. 377.

Forester to Henry, were 'your Lords, in their best array, with all your nation; and he received your Lords graciously with right good cheer.' A race then took place between D'Ailli and Hallum to get first to the cathedral pulpit, for 'the Cardinal Cameracence (Cambray), chief of the nation of France, and your special enemy also, had purposed to have made the collation for the King in worship of the French nation.' The Englishman won, and 'preached a sermon in the King's praise, the King sitting in a chair covered with cloth of gold, where formerly sat the Pope.'[1] Four days later the English repeated for Sigismund's benefit a mystery play on the Nativity, with which on the previous Sunday the English deputation had delighted the burghers of Constance.[2] The next day the imperial Sisyphus once more began a task, difficult enough before; through his new alliance, and the addition of the Spanish, now impossible.

Sigismund and the English were determined that before a new Pope was elected, the reformation of the Church should be seriously attempted.

[1] *F.Q.*, 187.

[2] Rymer, ix. 434–6; Hardt, iv. 1089–91. Hardt's claim, against Reuchlin, that this was the first theatrical representation in Germany, cannot be sustained, though frequently copied. See, for instance, in 1322 at Eisenach; Carlyle, *Essays*, iii. 189.

This originally had been the intention of the French, who groaned under an intolerable system of annates, the price they paid for the years during which they had kept a Pope of their own.[1] But D'Ailli was now more anxious to thwart the English than advance reform. He devoted himself to stirring up the race feuds. Meanwhile the cardinals, by skilfully playing on their jealousies, induced the nations to believe that the promotion of reform was a cunning device to bring the Church under Teutonic influences, and that, without a Pope to thwart it, the imperial power would be a menace to the national liberties of Europe. They had not surrendered a Pope at Avignon that they might establish a German at Mainz. By these arguments the French, among whom Gerson had lost his influence, were persuaded to join the Spanish and Italians in demanding the immediate election of a new Pontiff. A body without a head, they said, is of all deformities the worst; the election of a Pope is the first article of reformation.[2]

Meanwhile the steps needful to be taken

[1] See the *Collatio Cleri Gallicani* in Lab., xvi. 944–1000, giving the debate on the subject in the French nation in the autumn of 1415 (Oct. 15). They thus attempted to bring pressure on the committee of reform. See *supra*, p. 236.

[2] Sept. 1417 (Hardt, i. 919).

against Peter de Luna were purposely delayed, that the cardinals might not lose their last possible weapon.[1] The threats of secession on the part of the Spanish nation passed unrebuked. Cries were raised that the life and liberty of members of the Council was in danger. 'One night many of the French cardinals and delegates fortified their houses.' Rumour ran of plots and counterplots. So serious was the outlook that the Town Council found it needful to issue a proclamation, 'one Monday after dinner, that they would keep the Council and all its members as safe as if they were in their own houses.'[2]

The ceaseless struggle of nations in formation became more and more the dominant note. The call for reform became lost in the angry cries of the politicians. Throughout the spring and summer we see the debates on procedure drag wearily along. Day by day 'nothing was done,' except indeed, by the very delay, to put off all chance of reform to the Greek Kalends. Europe could not remain in permanent session at Constance.

The Council, in fact, had fallen to pieces, kept together only by external pressure. Its demo-

[1] Cf. Fillastre, *F.Q.*, 192, 'rumor magnus in Concilio quod cardinales impediebant unionem.'

[2] *F.Q.*, 194, 204, 207–9, 219.

cratic basis had issued in an intolerable licence: 'In the Council,' writes Fillastre, 'each and all had full rights of audience as often as they desired, even to the extent of protesting against the Council and its doings.' Its organisation by nations had reduced it to a struggle of cliques,—a King's party, 'whose committees met in secret after midnight,' and a cardinals' party. But the King's party was in the minority; for Sigismund's attempt at Whitsuntide to capture the control of three nations out of five, and thus isolate the French and Spanish, had been defeated, chiefly by means of the adherents of the fallen John, 'in spite of the king's threats to remove the disturbers of the Council, even if he had to give one hundred the sack!' All that Sigismund accomplished was to show that he had not thirteen adherents in the whole Italian nation, and to disgust many of the Germans and English with his violence. On another occasion he tried what he could effect by packing up his belongings and leaving Constance. 'The rumour ran that he was off to his war against France for the King of England. But three days later he was back again.' He had in fact played the same card once before, without success. He had lost his early chance of managing 'the business of the Council as he wished and when he wished.' Europe did not

intend to revive the worn-out pretensions of the Empire, least of all his one ally, Henry of England.[1]

Two nations, even when backed by the Emperor, could not permanently resist the will of three, especially when the three controlled, for all practical purposes, the whole machinery of the Church. The confusion of Sigismund was completed by the desertion of the English, whose close alliance with himself had hitherto been the talk of the Council, and one cause of his own powerlessness. The motives which led to this right about face are somewhat obscure, and have scarcely been satisfactorily explained. The prime cause was, however, the death of Hallum at Gottlieben, on Saturday, Sept. 4, 1417. But even before that disaster[2] Henry seems to have determined to act the part of "honest broker." Sigismund was pledged to assist him in a war on

[1] *F.Q.*, 196, 197, 201, 203, 211, 214.

[2] From Rymer, ix. 487—a letter of Cardinal Orsini to Henry—we learn that there were negotiations with Henry on the part of the cardinals before the death of Hallum ('hodie Sarisburiensis obiit'). The agent was Catrik, of whom Orsini speaks in suspicious terms: 'who day and night thinks of nothing save the completion of the union of the Church of God.' Henry's agents, Appleton, Clux (Rymer, ix. 412, 430, called Hartank), Stokes (Rymer, ix. 419, *supra*, p. 156 n.), and John Tiptoft (Rymer, ix. 385, 422–30) were always going to and from Constance.

France; but while the Council dragged on, the Emperor found it impossible to fulfil his promise. If the great question of reform was still to be settled before the election of a Pope, Henry saw clearly that he must postpone indefinitely the obtaining of any advantage from the Treaty of Canterbury, or even, perhaps, reaping further results from his victory at Agincourt. If by his mediation he could restore unity to Christendom, give the Church once more a head, win the gratitude of the new Pope, and at the same time hasten the great war, with its German alliance, he would have used his balance of power to the best advantage. Hallum was still lying unburied when the King's agents began to reverse his work. For in the events that followed, Henry was his own prime minister; his instrument, Catrik, Bishop of Lincoln, seems, however, to have been a clumsy politician, without finesse or straightforwardness.

In a general congregation on Thursday, Sept. 9, the cardinals once more pressed for an immediate election.

'To strengthen their request, the speaker added that the English nation had elected deputies to carry out the matter. Sigismund said it was not so, and that they denied it. And he ordered the English to be summoned. But it was true. For on the day before the English had appointed deputies with full powers, *i.e.* after the death of Hallum, who had died on the preceding Saturday. Four English bishops came in. And the

Bishop of Lichfield (Catrik), their president, answered that they had appointed deputies in the matter on the orders of Henry.[1] But Catrik wobbled in what he said; for he stated that they had followed, and wished to follow, the German nation.'[2]

Sigismund was naturally angry, and upbraided the English. His anger was not lessened by the events that followed. For one of the cardinals,

'speaking in a high voice to the Germans, cried out, "Germans, all other nations besides you have appointed deputies. Appoint, like the rest." And when no one replied, he handed to the Bp. of Bourges a written protest, which he began to read. At once the King rose up, and there was a great commotion. Once more the bishop began his reading. With a loud voice the King cried out, "By God! you shall not read." The tumult was worse than ever, and the King left. An Italian lawyer called out, "Nail the protest on the doors." When Sigismund heard the cry, he turned back. "You shall nail them on the doors," he said, and struck the lawyer with his fist. Then as he went out he called, "Those Italians and French want to give us a Pope. By God! they shall not do it."'[3]

As the King retired, 'someone cried out: "Let the heretics depart."'[4]

But Sigismund stood almost alone. The continued adhesion of Aragon,[5] Portugal, and the burghers of Constance did not outweigh the

[1] Note this. Cf. Finke, *F.Q.*, 227, 'ad mandatum regis Angliæ dimisit regem Romanorum,' and cf. Hardt, iv. 1426, from Schelstrat 'ex MS. Romano,' *i.e.* Fillastre.

[2] Finke, *F.Q.*, 220; Hardt, i. 916–20.

[3] Finke, *F.Q.*, 220.

[4] *Ibid.* 222; Hardt, i. 921, iv. 1416.

[5] For the split of Aragon and Castile, see *F.Q.*, 219. They

defection of the English. His resort to violence did not help him. When he closed the cathedral gates against the Council, 'a number of the cardinals, bishops, and doctors sat for almost two hours in the square, in the sun'—the last a personal note which indicates that Fillastre was present and suffered. A rumour ran that the cardinals would fly by night over the lake. Two different parties that Sigismund sent out in boats to search for fugitives by a mistake came to blows, each believing that the other ship was full of fleeing cardinals.[1] The cardinals, meanwhile, 'went about in red hats, as a sign, if needs be, of martyrdom.' The envoys of Castile and Navarre left the Council, but were prevented by Sigismund from going far. Some French who slipt out were detained at Schaffhausen.[2] 'The terror and tumult in the Council,' notes Fillastre, 'in these days is very great.' But at length Sigismund, in despair, deserted even by some of his own bishops, including the Archbishop of Riga, gave his consent to the election of a Pope (Oct. 2). He had struggled to the last, but in vain, to obtain a guarantee that the Pope, when elected, should continue at Constance until the completion of

made up the quarrel Sept. 27 (*F.Q.*, 276), and so further helped the discomfiture of Sigismund.

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 222. [2] *Ibid.* 223–226; Hardt, iv. 1417.

the work of reform. All he could secure was the decree *Frequens*,—so called from its first word,—ordaining that Councils should be held every five years, and limiting the power of the Pope to change the place of meeting or dissolve such Council when gathered.[1]

Neither king nor cardinals were yet out of the wood. Fresh difficulties arose as to the procedure at the conclave. Sigismund also desired 'that before the Pope was crowned or begun to rule there should be reformation.' The cardinals, on the other hand, maintained 'that a Pope, when once elected, could not be bound.'

'While matters were thus in doubt, news came that the Bp. of Winchester, the King's uncle, was in Ulm, two days' distance from Constance, on his way to Jerusalem. The English persuaded the cardinals that they should write to the bishop—inasmuch as he was very anxious for the union of the Church—and invite him to Constance, for he could do with Sigismund what he liked. This they did. Sigismund also wrote, and the Bp. of Lichfield went to Ulm and brought Winchester, in pilgrim garb with a cross, back to Constance' (*F.Q.*, 227).

The anxiety of Beaufort to continue his journey to Jerusalem was not great. 'He abode in Constance many days.' He had set off, in fact, at the wrong time of the year for travel. Fillastre was not alone in seeing through the device, or in believing that Sigismund and Henry had arranged

[1] Oct. 9, 1417; Hardt, iv. 1435; Lab., xvi. 700.

the matter, 'so that Beaufort might come to the Council and be made Pope.'[1] Only for such a prize can we imagine Beaufort suddenly resigning his Chancellorship for the pilgrim's staff. But whatever his motives, his mediation was successful.[2] An arrangement was at last concluded for certain reforms in the Curia, to be made after the election of a Pope. For the election itself a new departure was made, unique in the history of the Papacy. To the twenty-three cardinals there were added, 'for this time only,' six deputies from each of the five nations,—in itself a concession to the strong national passions of the Council.

For no nation, save the Italian, would listen to the claim of the cardinals that if they elected, 'the method would be more fair, secure, and easy.' Fillastre, too, had warned them in vain that a headless Council could not change the usages of the past: a Pope so elected would be no Pope at all.[3] He was thrown over by D'Ailli,

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 227–8. For date of Beaufort's visit, see Creighton, ii. 98 n. Fillastre's narrative seems to me to point to the middle of October, to make due allowance for events before and after. For Beaufort's passport (Porchester, July 21), see Rymer, ix. 467. He sailed on Sept. 11 (*ibid.* 491).

[2] Cf. Wals., ii. 319.

[3] *F.Q.*, 191, 198–9, 228. Finke prints a most interesting paper (*F.Q.*, 288–97), an attack and defence of the rights of the cardinals over election, dated 1417.

who clearly recognised the necessity for some compromise, though his motion for an equal number of cardinals and deputies, without the grouping by nations,[1] had been rejected. At last, on October 28, in the absence of Sigismund in Switzerland, 'the agreement was concluded between all the nations and the College' in 'the hall in the house of the Blackfriars in which is the great stove.' Any other method would probably have led to a new Schism. For, as Fillastre owns,

> 'No nation save the Italian wanted an Italian. And therein lay the chief cause of the unanimity of the other nations. The French did not want an Englishman, on account of the strife between these realms, nor a German, on account of Sigismund's bitterness against their King and realm, because of his league with England. For the same reason the English would not have a Frenchman, and no nation wanted a German. . . . There remains but the Spanish, and the Frenchmen who do not own allegiance to the King of France, namely, the Savoyards and Provençales. Thus to exclude one nation, four are excluded, and the liberty of choice largely restricted' (*F.Q.*, 213).

Fillastre's reasoning was logical, though his prophecy did not turn out correct.

On Monday, Nov. 8, 'a little before sunset,' amid much ceremony, the electors were shut in the Kaufhaus. The arrangements, says Fillastre, were perfect: 'Many dwelt there in greater peace

[1] Hardt, ii. 586–7; Lab., xvi. 1140.

than in their own homes.' Fifty-six chambers had been hastily constructed on the two upper floors, three being reserved for absentees.

'Two princes, the Master of Rhodes and another, who bore the great keys suspended from their necks, lived and slept, day and night, before the inner doors. On the steps of the Kaufhaus six armed men were stationed, on whom absolute silence was enjoined. Before the steps a table was placed, at which sat two bishops, a few doctors, and two servants. These were the examiners of food.'[1]

Their business was to detect hidden letters; while the Grand Master of Rhodes carried all cups to the window with his own hand. The deliberations of the conclave were not protracted: less so than might have been expected from the proviso that two-thirds of the cardinals, and two-thirds of each nation, must be agreed before an election could be valid. D'Ailli had set his sails to catch the wind, but after the first scrutiny he was thrown overboard. According to Fillastre, he was not even among the highest four. Zabarella, at one time the most likely candidate, was dead (Sept. 26). Beaufort's schemes, if schemes they were, had miscarried. On the third day, St. Martin's Day, 'at ten o'clock in the morning,'[2]

[1] Hardt, iv. 1481; cf. Wals., ii. 320. Reichental gives nine pictures of the election, including the tasters, the choristers singing in the early morning (note the torches).

[2] Cf. Martin's letter to Henry v., Rymer, ix. 523.

the Council, stirred into unanimity by the singing without of the hymn *Veni Creator Spiritus*, elected as the new Pope, Oddo Colonna, the simplest and poorest of the cardinals.[1]

The election was chiefly the work of the English, who, acting probably on orders, had steadily plumped for their candidate.[2] The Germans had followed; nor was the result unacceptable to Sigismund. The King, as soon as the result was announced, hastened to the hall and flung himself at the Pontiff's feet. Then, 'without dinner,' says Fillastre, 'though it was now one hour past noon,' we went, 'in mighty procession, to the cathedral.' After due thanksgivings, 'the Pope and the rest went to dine. And so the day finished, except that after dinner the Pope summoned certain of his cardinals, and took counsel what was best to do.' The result was seen on the morrow, when Martin confirmed one of the grievances of the age, against which the

[1] Finke, *F.Q.*, 234; cf. Palacky, *Doc.*, 667. These two documents give the best version of the election, the details of which Fillastre should know. For other conflicting accounts, see Creighton, ii. 364–5. Lenz. *Sig. and H. V.*, 172–95, and the comments of Finke, *F.Q.*, 80.

[2] According to Wals., ii. 320, Beaufort had some votes. If so, they were not English, for Fillastre is plain that all voted together for Martin from the first, acting on previous orders to be unanimous (see Rymer, ix. 466).

reformers of the Council had protested, the oppressive rules of the Roman Chancery.[1] On the 21st Colonna was crowned in the cathedral with all the usual ceremonies, and took the name of Martin v. 'On his return to the palace,' adds Fillastre, 'he asked no one to dinner.' But Beaufort, at anyrate, was not forgotten. On Dec. 28 Martin sent him a cardinal's hat. But Henry would not allow his uncle to accept it.[2]

IV

With the election of a new and undoubted Pope, and the reaction of Europe from the despair of the Schism, all hope of reform speedily disappeared. The cardinals had won; their interests were now safe. The Council speedily discovered that it had given itself a master. All parties were chiefly anxious to make terms for themselves with the spiritual head of Christendom. When urged by the French to prosecute the reforms, even Sigismund replied that he 'had not the same interest in the matter as before.' 'You have a Pope, implore him for reform.'[3] He had, in fact, made his peace with Martin, and received his reward—

[1] Lab., xvi. 1275–92; Hardt, i. 954–91.
[2] *F.Q.*, 235; Hardt, iv. 1502.
[3] Gob. Pers. *Cosmod.*, vi. 345.

a tenth for one year of the ecclesiastical revenues of Germany, and his recognition as King of the Romans; this last, however, not without difficulty, and the promise of amendment of certain abuses in Hungary.[1] After taking an oath 'on the wood of the true cross,' Sigismund was then anointed and invested with the sword (Jan. 25, 1418).[2]

The Pope himself maintained an astute silence: he left political animosities and individual selfishness to accomplish the work of disunion. The Curia, as usual, knew its own mind; but so hopeless was unanimity in the Council, even over the most trivial matters, that it was finally settled (March 21)[3] that each nation should be left to settle its own grievances by a separate concordat with the Pope. In its general weariness of endless wrangles, the Council had but one desire—to make what haste it could to be gone. On Friday, April 22, 1418, the Council assembled in its forty-fifth and last session. Martin took advantage of a dispute, introduced by the Poles, to observe 'that he

[1] Finke, 237. For the tithe matter, see Hardt, ii. 589–621.

[2] Finke, 237; cf. *Doc.*, 675–7, which corrects the date in Fillastre and Creighton (Jan. 23). Sigismund was not crowned Emperor until May 31, 1433, in St. Peter's, by Eugenius IV.

[3] Lab., xvi. 718.

would observe generally and inviolably all that had been settled in matters of faith in the Council itself in full session, but not otherwise.' The Council in its weariness or indifference, did not notice the terms so fraught with ambiguities.[1] They turned to listen to a last sermon on the text, "Ye have now sadness, but I shall see you again." Martin then declared the Council dissolved.

Three weeks later the Pope set out for Geneva and Italy, twelve cardinals, so the admiring Reichental tells us, marching before him, the Emperor himself leading his white horse, at his side a knight carrying a huge parasol, and attended to Gottlieben by 40,000 horsemen.[2] He had wisely turned a deaf ear to all the entreaties of Sigismund that he would take up his abode in Germany—in Basel, Strassburg, or Mainz. With his departure, Constance sank from the centre of Christendom into that same sleepy little town of six thousand fishermen and burghers, which Robert Wyngfield, ambassador of England, when detained there by the weather, discovered to be so full of unchanged associations of a memorable past.[3]

[1] See Appendix N, p. 362.

[2] Hardt, iv. 1583. Pictures in Wolf.

[3] Hardt, v. 53. Visit undated (? Dec. 1507. See *D.N.B.*).

But one of the visitors did not find it so easy to leave. Throughout life Sigismund had been crippled by his lack of money. He could only pay for his return journey from London to Constance by sending his servant to Bruges to pawn, for 18,000 ducats, the presents he had just received from the victor of Agincourt. After the departure of Martin, Sigismund found that he was virtually a prisoner. The shrewd burghers, to whom he owed large sums, on various pretences kept a sharp watch over his movements. There were no more Brandenburgs to sell, so he was forced to call a meeting of his creditors. By eloquently ringing the changes on the glory he had brought to Constance, he at last won their consent to his departure, on condition that his linen and hangings were left behind as a pledge. When the luckless citizens sought to realise, they found that these were unsaleable: they were all embroidered with his own coat-of-arms.

The Council was ended—what had it accomplished? Nothing, except to demonstrate the impossibility of the Conciliar idea, and to shatter beyond recovery the reforming party in the University of Paris. It had met with a large programme: the Papacy was to be reformed; the abuses of absolutism checked; national

synods—suppressed by papal centralisation—were to be revived; the cardinals were to be fairly apportioned to the different nations; the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts, especially the right of appeal to papal courts, to be defended; the extortions of Rome to be done away; the sale of dispensations and indulgences to be restricted. For the future, the Papacy should be a constitutional executive: the real government would be vested in an ecclesiastical parliament of all nations, to meet every five years. Of all this wonderful programme, little of importance save the last remained; a few still-born decrees, worthy rather of a Provincial Synod, and the ghost of an idea.

The Council, we may own, had deposed a Pope, and in so doing had seemed to assert its supremacy; but the first act of the new Pope was to kick down the ladder whereby he had climbed. By an early constitution, Martin decreed 'that no one may appeal from the supreme judge,—that is, the Roman Pontiff, vicar on earth of Jesus Christ,—or may decline his authority in matters of faith' (March 10, 1418). In vain Gerson protested, in a treatise written during his exile, that this 'destroyed the whole authority not only of Pisa, but of Constance, and made all that the Council had done of no effect.' The

Council was absorbed in the collision of national interests, and let the constitution slip by default. So long, in fact, as there was no real Pope, all went well; but directly a new Pope was elected and the Schism healed, Rome once more asserted its determination to be supreme, to allow nothing to be done which could restrict its revenue or power. National frictions, the conflicts of universities, bishops, and orders—all played into its hands. As Martin set off from Constance for Rome, he could congratulate himself that the Papacy, phœnix-like, had risen from the flames that seemed at one time destined to destroy it. He had been forced to fix the meeting of the next Council. He had chosen Pavia (April 19, 1418). Fortune might deliver him from the necessity of fulfilling his own decree. At anyrate, Pavia was in Italy. It would be the fault of the Papacy itself if it did not make the Council into its servant. Martin's determination was clear: Constance should never be repeated.

Martin might even flatter himself that the Babylonish captivity and the Schism, like some foul disease from which recovery seemed hopeless, had revealed the real strength of the Papacy and the indestructibility of the ideas upon which it was based. In truth, "among all

its divisions the history of the Church shows none so frightful and so injurious as this. Any temporal kingdom would have perished in it." [1] The speedy restoration of the power of the Papacy, after the accession of Martin, is in fact almost as wonderful as the suddenness of its downfall under Boniface VIII. But we can see to-day, what was hidden from the eyes of that generation, that the restoration was something very different to the restoration of the old Hildebrandine ideal. It was rather the impatience with which a patient who has suffered many things in trying new doctors and new prescriptions, returns for a while, though without confidence or joy, to the old nostrums of former leeches. But Rome mistook this confidence, renewed by despair, for the old allegiance, born of conviction and mystic faith.

Nevertheless, the Papacy, if it had been wise, would have discerned the signs of the times in a matter which probably short-sightedness miscalculated into an advantage. We allude to the concordats.[2] The Curialists, no doubt, con-

[1] Greg., vi. 649.

[2] For the German Concordat (approved March 21, signed April 15, 1418), see Hardt, i. pt. 24. For the English, *ibid.* pt. 25. For the French Concordat, which carried also the Italian and Spanish nations (Creighton, ii. 112 n.), see Lab., xvi. 729–39. The English and French Concordats were never

gratulated themselves on their general unimportance. These treaties between the several nations and the popes left abuses much as they were: they strained out a few gnats, they swallowed camels. No greater misfortune could have happened to the Papacy. For the importance of the concordats lay in the determination of the nations, at anyrate of England and France, to fall back for the safeguarding of their rights upon the superiority of the royal power over that of Church or Pope. Constance revealed not only the end of that medieval solidarity in which the Papacy had found its strength, of which it had been the keystone, but also the determination of the separate nations to brook no rival, whether Canon Law, Church, or Pontiff, within their borders.

ratified. The German and English Concordats are short and unimportant—the English, in fact, only contains six articles. Both complain of the number of indulgences. The first article of all the concordats shows a desire to keep up the national idea in the future composition of the College. On the concordats, see also Lenfant, *C.C.*, 749–69; Hefele, vii. 349–65.

CHAPTER VI

THE TRIAL AND DEATH OF HUS

Observe how firmly Hus clung in his writings and words to the doctrines of Christ; with what courage he struggled against the agonies of death; with what patience and humility he suffered every indignity, and with what greatness of soul he at last confronted a cruel death in defence of the truth; doing all these things alone before an imposing assembly of the great ones of the earth, like a lamb in the midst of lions and wolves. If such a man is to be regarded as a heretic, no person under the sun can be looked on as a true Christian. By what fruits then shall we recognise the truth, if it is not manifest by those with which John Hus was so richly adorned?

MARTIN LUTHER: (in 1537, *Mon. Hus*, Preface, vol. i.).

Scio, quod vincit qui occiditur.

WORDS OF HUS: *Documenta*, p. 62.

The general sources have been already indicated at length. See *supra*, p. 88. For the present chapter, they are mainly PALACKY'S *Documenta* (for Hus's invaluable letters, and MLADENOWIC'S *Relatio*), and also Hardt for other matters of the Council. Other sources are indicated in the notes. The sections of REICHENTAL on Hus and Jerome are abstracted in HÖFLER, *Ges.*, ii. 399–405. Fillastre, unfortunately, was ill during the trial of Hus (*F.Q.*, 177), so we miss his Journal.

Of special monographs, note the following :—

W. BERGER, *J. Hus and K. Sigismund* (Augsburg, 1871), for the defence of Sigismund over the matter of the passport. For the trial of Hus, LEA, *Inquis. in M.A.* (New York, 1887), vol. ii. pp. 426–505, seems to me a safe guide, from his masterly knowledge of all the details of the Inquisition.

For Jerome of Prague we are chiefly dependent on Hardt and the *Documenta*. HÖFLER, *Geschichtsschreiber*, i. 331–6, has printed an account of his death by Master Lawrence de Brezina. See also the two versions, *Mon.*, ii. 349–357. POGGIO'S famous letter to Aretin has been often printed, Hardt, v. 64–71 ; *Doc.*, 624–9. BROWN, *Fasciculus rerum Expetendarum*, i. 304–6 ; *Mon.*, 358*a*–359*b* ; HEFELE, vii. 280–3, and other places. It has been often translated. DIETRICH VRIE gives scant attention to Jerome or Hus. See his *Hist. Conc. Const.* (Hardt, i. (1) 171–4, 202).

Of modern writers, NEANDER and HEFELE give considerable space to both Hus and Jerome, of course from very different standpoints. HEFELE (vii. 218–228) says all that can be said on the Roman side over the safe-conduct. PALACKY, *Ges.* iii. (1) 306–68, is always valuable, while LENFANT, *C.C.*, has given a scattered but complete abstract of Hardt.

The Bohemian War and the rise of the Moravian Church fall outside my limits. For the one, the reader may consult E. DENIS, *Huss et la Guerre des Hussites* (Paris, 1878) ; for the other, DE SCHWEINITZ, *Unitas Fratrum* (1885).

THE TRIAL AND DEATH OF HUS

For all Thy saints, O Lord,
Who strove in Thee to live,
Who followed Thee, obeyed, adored,
Our grateful hymn receive.

For all Thy saints, O Lord,
Accept our thankful cry,
Who counted Thee their great reward,
And strove in Thee to die.

MEMORIAL HYMN OF THE MORAVIAN CHURCH FOR HUS'S DEATH-DAY.

I

WHEN Sigismund summoned the Council of Constance, the termination of the Schism was not his only object. As heir to the throne of Bohemia, he felt the need of removing from the land the stain of heresy. He realised keenly that 'throughout the whole earth resounded the rumour that the Bohemians are sons of heretical baseness.' At Vienna, Czech students had been mobbed as 'followers of heresy, bearing honey in their mouths, but the incurable poison of asps in

their hearts.'[1] As the Chancellor of Paris, and therefore, in the eyes of that great University, the guardian of the orthodoxy of the Church, Gerson had already written to Archbishop Conrad of Prague reminding him that 'while prelates and doctors and secular princes have slept, many have sown in abundance throughout your diocese the tares of diverse errors which had their origin in the writings of John Wyclif.' He urges Conrad to call in the secular arm, 'lest the canker should spread.' In a second letter[2] Gerson despatched to Conrad a series of articles from Hus's *De Ecclesia* which the Paris doctors had condemned. In a postscript he laid his finger on one in special: 'that a ruler living in mortal sin can have no jurisdiction over Christians.' He rightly held that such a doctrine is 'destructive of all political order and quiet.' He urges Conrad 'to show Wenzel the danger of such teaching in his own kingdom.' This Wenzel, probably in his sober

[1] *Doc.*, 512; cf. 63. Steph. Dol., 184; Sagan, 91, 92; Loserth, 343-6. The antagonism between the Univs. of Vienna and Prague is a factor often overlooked. The Univ. Vienna was founded in 1365 by the jealousy of the Hapsburgs. It was revived in 1383 when Henry of Langenstein was attracted to it by Duke Albert III. (Rashdall, *Univs.*, ii. 232-42). Vienna at this time was in the diocese of Passau.

[2] May 27, 1414, *Doc.*, 523-6. Sept. 24, 1414, *Doc.*, 527-8; cf. 529, and the reply of Conrad, *Doc.*, 526. For the articles themselves, *Doc.*, 185-8.

moments, had discerned. That Wyclif and Hus could have held such a doctrine at all must be attributed not so much to defective insight, as to the crude efforts of a new individualism to find some other basis for the State than in mere autocracy.

Whatever steps Wenzel might take, Sigismund determined to bring the matter before the Council. He was persuaded that the affair could be peaceably settled, and that he would win the gratitude of Bohemia.[1] He accordingly despatched from Lombardy[2] two of his court to bid Hus present himself at Constance. The good intention of Sigismund was evident in his choice. John of Chlum and Wenzel of Duba were both adherents of Hus. Sigismund also promised that he would obtain for him a full hearing, and send him a safe-conduct 'written in Latin and German.'

Hus at once prepared to obey. In view of his own appeal to a General Council, he could not do otherwise. He was too unconscious, also, of his real dissent from Rome to know the risks he ran. His next move was not without worldly wisdom. On Aug. 26 he presented himself at Prague and offered 'to render an account of his faith and hope' before the Synod then in session. On the refusal of the Synod to receive either

[1] Berger. *op. cit.* 90; cf. *Doc.*, 71 (statement by Hus).
[2] Friuli, *Doc.*, 248, 237.

Hus or his proctor Jesenic, Hus 'posted up notices throughout all Prague in Latin and Czech,' to the effect that he was going to Constance, and would there meet all accusers. But he did not neglect to take steps for his defence.

'On August 30th, in the upper room of the house of the Master of the Mint, John de Jesenic, the procurator of Hus, humbly but earnestly inquired of Nicholas, Bp. of Nazareth, inquisitor of heresy for the city and diocese of Prague: "Reverend Father, do you know of any error or heresy in Master John de Husinecz, *alias* Hus." To which the said Lord Nicholas answered, not of compulsion, but freely and publicly in the Czech tongue: "I have met Master John Hus many times and in many places, eating and drinking with him. I have often been present at his sermons. I have had many talks with him on diverse matters of Holy Scripture. In all his words and deeds I have ever found him to be a true and catholic man, in nowise savouring of heresy or error."'

Certain of the nobles procured a similar declaration from the archbishop.[1]

On Sept. 1 Hus despatched a letter to Sigismund, with these certificates of orthodoxy, thanking him also for his promised safe-conduct. He rejoiced, he said, in the opportunity he would have of thus professing in the Council the faith he holds:

'For as I have taught nothing in private, but in public, when masters, bachelors, priests, barons, knights, and others were

[1] *Doc.*, 237–43, 66–8, 70. It is impossible not to feel that the intimidation of which Palecz speaks (*Mon.*, i. 255*b*) must have been at work; cf. *Doc.*, 198.

present in great numbers, so now I desire to make answer not in secret, but in public, the Spirit of the Lord helping me. For I hope that I shall not be afraid to confess my Lord Christ, and, if needs be, to suffer death for His true law' (*Doc.*, 69–71).

The remainder of the month seems to have been occupied in the preparation of three sermons which he intended to deliver before the Council. In his singular simplicity he imagined that these would win the approval of the more serious among the Council, and even bring about the reforms he desired. He did not see that the first,—*On the Sufficiency of the Law of Christ* (*i.e.* the Gospel)[1] *for the Government of the Church*,—a familiar theme with Wyclif, really cut at the very roots of the medieval system. A second sermon, on *Peace*, was taken almost word for word, though without acknowledgment, from a similar sermon of Wyclif's. Hus thus proposed to deliver in his defence a sermon of the heresiarch already condemned to be burnt. Like other orators, Hus was misled by the effects of his eloquence. He forgot that at Constance he would not be dealing with the excitable congregation of the Bethlehem, but with the shrewdest and keenest intellects of Europe.[2]

[1] Cf. Hus, *Octo Doctorum* in *Mon.*, i. 294*b*.

[2] For these sermons, see *Mon.*, i. 44–57; Loserth, 274–9. They are written in moderate language. The third was *De*

Sigismund was anxious that Hus should journey in his suite. The Reformer would have fared better, as the King remarked, if he had accepted the offer.[1] Such, however, was his confidence in his integrity, that Hus even set off, under the guard of John of Chlum and Wenzel of Duba, without waiting for the safe-conduct (Oct. 11). The whole party consisted of thirty mounted men and two carts, in one of which Hus rode with his books. 'God be with you,' cried a Polish tailor, 'for I do not think you will return.' Others of his friends were of the same opinion:

> They told me in Bohemia to beware of the safe-conduct. Some said: Sigismund will betray you. Diwoky added, in the presence of Jesenic: Master, you may know for certain that you will be condemned. I think that he knew the intention of the King.[2]

But these were after reminiscences, not altogether fair to Sigismund.

A presentiment of his fate led Hus to leave with

Fidei Elucidatione. I give a sentence which will serve as a specimen of Hus's simplicity: 'Patet quod docendus est populus credere in solum Deum, et non in beatam Virginem, necnon in sanctos, et omnino non in Papam, vel Praelatas alios, cum non sint Deus, nec in Ecclesiam!' (*Mon.*, i. 50*a*).

[1] *Doc.*, 612; cf. 252. Hence, probably, Sigismund's delay over the safe-conduct, which was dated Spires, Oct. 18 (*Doc.*, 238). Hus would barely receive the official promise of the safe-conduct (Rothenburg, Oct. 8, *Doc.*, 533) before setting off.

[2] *Doc.*, 111, 114.

his disciple Martin a sealed letter, 'not to be opened unless you hear for certain that I am dead':

'Master Martin, dearest brother in Christ,—I exhort you in the Lord that you fear God, keep His commandments, flee the company of women. Be cautious when hearing their confessions. . . . Do not struggle for a benefice; but if called to a living, let the honour of God and the salvation of souls move you. Beware of having a young cook . . . and don't spend your money in feasts. . . . I beseech you, by the pity of Christ, that you do not follow me in any frivolity which you have detected in me. . . . My grey gown you can keep as a memento. But I think you do not care for grey; so give it to whom you like. My white gown give to the curé. To my pupil George Grizikon give sixty groschen or my grey gown, because he has faithfully served me' (*Doc.*, 74, 75).

Equally tender was his farewell (in Czech) to his congregation at the Bethlehem Chapel, Prague:

'Faithful and dear friends,—You know that for a long time I have faithfully instructed you, preaching to you the Word of God without heresy or falsehood. For I have always sought, and shall ever seek, as long as I live, your salvation. I had intended to preach to you before my journey to Constance, and to lay bare before you the false evidence and false witnesses against me. If I am condemned, persevere still in the truth, without hesitation, with no dread at heart that I have been condemned on account of any heresy.[1] . . . Beloved brothers

[1] This was twisted at Constance into a charge that he wrote to his friends that if he abjured, 'it would be with his lips, not his heart.' Hus puts it down to faulty translation of the Czech (*Doc.*, 84, 274, 311). In this matter of Czech, as he often complained, he was at the mercy of his Bohemian enemies. Cf. *Doc.*, 175, 179.

and sisters, pray earnestly that God may deign to give me perseverance and keep me from all blemish. But if in any ways my death may redound to His greater glory and your advantage, may He grant that I may meet it without evil fear. . . . Perhaps you will not see me in Prague again before my death. But if Almighty God should in His mercy bring me back to you again, with what gladness shall we see each other, at any-rate when we meet in heavenly bliss' (*Doc.*, 71–73).

The journey of Hus to Constance was a triumphal progress, which strengthened his sanguine delusion. He rode along without disguise: he found he needed none.

'As soon as I crossed the frontier, at Pernau, the rector and his curates met me. When I entered the common room of the inn (*stubam*), he at once fetched a great beaker of wine, and said that he had always been my friend. . . . At Sulzbach we arrived at an inn in which a court was sitting. So I went up to the magistrates round the fire and said: "I am John Hus, about whom you have heard, I imagine, much scandal. Ask me what questions you like."'[1]

As Hus rode along, he 'posted up notices on the doors of the churches in Latin and German,' setting forth the reasons of his journey.[2] He was amazed to find that there seemed to be no race-hatred against him: 'I have not yet found one enemy.' Nor was any attempt made to put into force against him the edict of excommunication, 'though he called out his name in a loud voice.'[3] His escort entered as heartily as himself

[1] Cf. Wesley's *Journals*, i. 478.

[2] *Doc.*, 245, 77, 79.

[3] *Doc.*, 76, 83.

into the propaganda of reform. In the Free City of Bibrach, John of Chlum argued so strenuously 'with the priests and other men of culture on obedience due to the Pope, excommunication, and other matters, that the rumour spread through the whole town that he was a doctor of theology' —"Doctor Bibrach," as Hus afterwards jestingly called him.[1] Arriving at Nuremberg, Hus found that the news of his coming had been brought by some merchants.

'As we entered, the people stood in the streets gazing and inquiring: "Which is Master Hus?" Before dinner the rector of St. Lawrence sent me a letter saying that he had long wished to have a free talk with me. I wrote back on the same sheet, "Come!" and he came. . . . When the burghers and magistrates, wishing to see and converse with me, came to my inn, I at once rose up from the table to meet them. The magistrates gave instructions that our conversation should be private. I replied: "I preach publicly; moreover, I want everybody to hear." And so we openly conversed together until nightfall. I noticed that the rector of St. Sebald's was sore displeased because the citizens were on my side. In fact, all the magistrates and citizens stood round me, right well pleased. . . . In every inn I leave the host a copy of the Ten Commandments.'[2]

At Nuremberg, Hus heard that Sigismund was down the Rhine. He decided 'to go direct' to the Council; 'for we judge it would be absurd to

[1] *Doc.*, 93, 94; cf. 78.

[2] *Doc.*, 76, Oct. 20. The student would do well to remember that Nuremberg was a head-centre of the Friends of God.

after the King sixty (German) miles and then return to Constance.' So the next letter of Hus was written from Constance, which he entered 'riding through a vast crowd.'[1] There he lodged with 'a certain widow Faith in the street of St. Paul,' who kept a bakery with the sign of the White Pigeon close by the Schnetzthor. From this house, as Chlum tells us,[2] he never stirred until his arrest. But he irritated his opponents by daily saying mass in his lodgings, in spite of his excommunication.[3]

The day after his arrival Hus wrote to his friends in Prague:

'We arrived in Constance on the Saturday after All Saints', and are lodged in a street near the Pope's. We came without a safe-conduct.[4] The day after our arrival Michael de Causis filed accusations against me in the cathedral, and affixed his signature, with a long commentary that "the writs are against that excommunicated and obstinate suspect John Hus." With the help of God I take no notice of the matter. . . . In three days Sigismund ought to be in Aachen for his coronation. I

[1] *Doc.*, 78, Nov. 3.

[2] *Doc.*, 262. For the residence of Hus, see Marmor, *op. cit.* 69 n.

[3] *Doc.*, 80, 83.

[4] This was used against him, *infra*, p. 320. Hus then explained that he meant 'a safe-conduct from the Pope' (*Doc.*, 89). As a matter of fact, he did not receive Sigismund's safe-conduct until after his entrance into Constance, though before his arrest. See pp. 275 and 280.

imagine he will scarcely arrive here before Christmas Day, so I think the Council, if it is not dissolved, will end about Easter. Lacembok is riding off to-day to Sigismund, before whose arrival he has ordered me to attempt nothing. The living here is very dear, a bed costing half a florin a week. Horses command high prices. . . . I think I shall not be long before I want common necessaries. Mention my uneasiness on this, please, to my friends, whom it would take too long to name. There are many Parisians[1] and Italians here, but few archbishops, and even few bishops. The cardinals are numerous, riding about on mules; but oh, such scrubs! . . . Many of our Bohemians have spent on the way all the money they had, and are now suffering misery. I am full of sympathy, but cannot afford to give to all' (*Doc.*, 77–8, Nov. 4).

That same day 'Chlum and Lacembok waited on the Pope, informing him that they had brought Hus to Constance under the safe-conduct of Sigismund, and begging that the Pope would not allow violence to be done to him. The Pope replied that even if Hus had killed his own brother he should be safe' (*Doc.*, 246).

Two days later Hus despatched another letter to Prague. It begins with a pun. His letters, even in prison, are full of jests, both on his own name and on passing events:

'I came to *Constance* without the Pope's safe-conduct. Pray God, therefore, that He give me *constancy*, because many strong adversaries have risen up against me, stirred up by the sellers

[1] Hus was mistaken. See John XXIII.'s letter of Dec. 6, expostulating with the French ecclesiastics because they had not come, Finke, *F.Q.*, 316.

of indulgences. But I fear none of them, hoping that after a great fight I shall win a great victory, and after the victory a great reward, and greater discomfiture of my enemies. . . . On my journey here I had a herald, the Bishop of Lübeck, who was always one night ahead of me. He published abroad that they were conducting me in a cart in chains, and that people must beware of me, for I could read men's thoughts. So whenever we drew near a town, crowds turned out as if to a show. . . . But the enemy was overthrown by his own lie, and the people grateful when they heard the truth. Surely Christ Jesus is with me as a strong champion. Therefore will I not fear what the enemy can do. I think I shall be hard up, if the Council is protracted' (*Doc.*, 78, Nov. 6).

II

Meanwhile approaches had been made to the Pope for a compromise. 'What can I do?' answered John; 'your side force the action.' Nevertheless 'two bishops and a doctor had some talk with Chlum that we should come to terms under a pledge of silence.' 'I know,' replied Hus, 'that they fear my public address, which I hope, by the grace of God, I shall deliver when Sigismund comes.'[1] The sanguine simplicity of Hus neither understood nor heeded the moves of diplomacy. On Nov. 9 John went so far as to send the Bishop of Constance to Hus's lodgings, with the proposition that the Pope, 'out of the plenitude of his power,

[1] *Doc.*, 79.

should suspend the interdict and excommunication against Hus, asking him only, for fear of scandal, not to be present at the High Masses. With this exception, he might go where he liked in Constance and its churches.' Hus refused, however, to give up his private masses. 'The Goose,' added John Cardinalis, reporting the matter, 'is not yet cooked, nor fears cooking, because this year Martinmas falls on a Saturday, when geese are not eaten.' Meanwhile 'someone, we know not whether friend or foe, gave out to-day in a church that Hus would preach to the clergy the following Sunday in the cathedral, and give a ducat to everyone who was present.'[1]

Another rumour, more damaging still, obtained wide credence. A hay-waggon with a large cover had been noticed in his street. In this, it was said, Hus had attempted to escape: he was actually in the cart, when his friends Chlum and Lacembok, who were not in the secret, ran and informed the burgomaster, and charged Hus with having broken his safe-conduct.[2] Through-

[1] *Doc.*, 80. From *Doc.*, 262, we learn that it was reported that he had actually preached. I cannot say that I feel much confidence in the accuracy of John Cardinalis's report of John's offer.

[2] This story is told by Reichental, p. 58, and adopted by many, even by Lea, *op. cit.* ii. 459. Reichental gives, however,

out the Council, Constance was full of such reports: the city was too crowded and nervous for it to be otherwise. The rumour, though false, would not seem so at the time. At anyrate, it furnished the managers of the Council, ill satisfied with the Pope's negotiations, with an excuse for bringing Hus under the grip of the Inquisition. The method they adopted, showed either vacillation or duplicity. On Nov. 28 the cardinals sent, at breakfast-time, to Hus to inform him 'that they were now ready to hear him.' Chlum at once detected the plot, for the house was surrounded with soldiers. 'The devil himself,' he said to the burgomaster, 'if he came to plead, ought to have a fair hearing.' 'I have not come,' added Hus, rising from the table, 'to address the cardinals, but the whole Council.' The envoys replied, 'that they had come only for the sake of peace, to avoid a tumult.' After further parley, Hus consented to go with them.

the impossible date of March 3. Mladenowic (*Doc.*, 247) gives a satisfactory explanation of the origin of the tale; while the evidence of Chlum, that Hus never left the house (*Doc.*, 262), is sufficient. The part assigned to Chlum in the tale is absurd. Above all, we hear nothing further of the matter in the trial, a point which Hus's enemies would never have left out if true. Reichental has confused Hus and Jerome, or else the tale was started to try and explain away the breach of the safe-conduct, and written down by Reichental in all simplicity.

'God bless you,' he said, bidding farewell on the stairs to his weeping hostess. The two bishops, for their part, could not conceal their joy. 'Now,' they said, 'you will not say mass here any more.' 'So Hus rode away on a small horse to the Pope's palace.' Interrogated by the cardinals: 'rather than hold any heresy,' he replied, 'I would prefer to die.' Your words are good, replied the cardinals, and retired to dine, leaving Hus to be badgered by a Franciscan friar, who posed 'as a simple monk desirous of information.' 'You call yourself simple,' said Hus; 'I call you double.' 'Do you know who that was?' asked the soldiers; 'he is Master Didaco, reputed the subtlest theologian in all Lombardy.' Meanwhile John Cardinalis, who had come with Hus, had his own little skirmish with Palecz. 'O, Master John,' said Palecz,

'how sorry I am for you; you who were once in high repute with the Curia, more so than any Czech, and now they hold you of no account because you have joined that sect.' 'Master Stephen,' replied Cardinalis, 'I am more troubled about you. As for you, if you know any evil that I have done, then alone ought you to be sorry over me.'[1]

[1] John Cardinalis of Reinstein, vicar of Janowicz, was a favourite diplomatic agent of Wenzel. See Wenzel's letter to the Pisan cardinals, Nov. 24, 1408 (*Doc.*, 343–4; *Lab. Sup.*, iii. 906). 'J. C. de R. familiaris devotus fidelis dilectus, Pat^{tes} V^{ras} latius informabit cui in referendis hujusmodi fidem

After dinner,

'at four in the afternoon, the cardinals returned to consider further what they should do with the said Hus. His adversaries, Palecz and Michael the Pleader, continued instant in their demand that he should not be released. Dancing round the fire, they called out in their joy: "Ha, ha, we have him now! He shall not leave us until he has paid the last farthing."'

Chlum, meanwhile, sought out the Pope, reminded him of his promise, blamed him allowing the badgering of Didaco. John took refuge in characteristic evasions. As for the friar, 'he is a clown; he is not one of my people.' The imprisonment was the act of the cardinals. 'You know very well,' he added, 'the terms on which I stand with them.' Had Hus, he inquired, really a safe-conduct? 'Holy Father,' replied Chlum, 'you know that he has.' The honest knight was too straightforward himself to discern John's intention of embroiling Sigismund and the cardinals in a conflict over Hus.[1]

The fate of Hus was really sealed. That night, 'about nine, he was led away to the house of one of the precentors of the cathedral.' Eight

nostro nomine velitis credulam adhibere, singularem nobis in eo complacentiam ostensuri.' In *Doc.*, 693, he is called 'hereticus principalis.'

[1] *Doc.*, 247–51. But Cerretanus (Hardt, iv. 22) represents the Pope as asking about a safe-conduct from himself.

days later (Dec. 6) he was removed 'to a dark cell hard by the latrines,'[1] in the monastery of the Blackfriars, on an island in the Lake. A week in this hole brought on a fever so severe 'that they despaired of his life. But John sent his own physician, who administered to him clysters.'[2] The death of the prisoner before his condemnation would have been inconvenient.

Chlum, meanwhile, was not inactive. He reported the matter to Sigismund, and 'showed and read aloud the said safe-conduct to the notables of Constance.' On Dec. 24, knowing that Sigismund was near, he posted up a notice on the doors of the cathedral, 'complaining that the Pope had not kept faith with him'; the insult to the safe-conduct was a step upon which they would not have ventured 'if Sigismund had been present.' Honest Chlum was mistaken. Whatever Sigismund's previous intentions, when he arrived he blustered a little,[3] but did nothing except procure for Hus a better lodging in the

[1] Not an uncommon device of the Inquisition; see Lea, *op. cit.* ii. 461.

[2] *Doc.*, 85, 252.

[3] I attach no value to John's report: 'cum intimationibus et minis de frangendis carceribus,' written March 23, from Schaffhausen, when he was trying to bring Sigismund and the Council into ill repute (Hardt, ii. 255; Lab., xvi. 805).

refectory.[1] He probably realised his own powerlessness; for on Jan. 1 a deputation from the Council warned him that he must not interfere with the liberty of the Council in the investigation of heresy, 'under the pretext of a safe-conduct.'[2] But let us hear his excuse in his own words:

'If Hus had first come to us, and gone with us to Constance, perhaps his affair would have turned out differently. We call God to witness that we sorrowed much on his account, and at what had happened, especially because nothing further could be done. Moreover, all the Bohemians who were with us saw clearly that we pleaded his case, and that several times we left the Council in anger. Nay, on his account we even departed

---

[1] From *Doc.*, 99 (lines 8 and 9), we learn that this was done on Jan. 8. This fixes the date of letter No. 46 (*Doc.*, 85) as written before Jan. 8, probably on Jan. 1, for otherwise there is contradiction. No. 46, if my reasoning is correct, is therefore the only letter written from the first prison. For Sigismund's action over Hus, see Hardt, iv. 26–32, who gives Jan. 3 for date of new prison.

[2] Hardt, iv. 32. Sigismund at once capitulated, which agrees with the Vat. MS. in Finke, *F.Q.*, 253–4, 'Addidit etiam ipse rex quod factum Joannis Hus et alia minora non debebant reformationem ecclesiæ impedire' (Jan. 1). If Sigismund left Constance at all (see next paragraph), I should incline to think it was only to his lodgings, which at first were at Petershausen, on the other side of the Rhine. Most historians (*e.g.* Creighton, ii. 31 n.) state that Sigismund withdrew his safe-conduct on Jan. 1. I imagine Hardt has confused this with Sigismund's action on April 8 (*Doc.*, 543), which, however, had nothing to do with Hus.

from Constance, until they sent deputies to inquire from us: "Whether we were unwilling that justice should be done in the Council, and (if so) what business detained them there?" So we saw that we could do nothing in the matter, nor was there any advantage in discussing the matter further; for, had we done so, the Council would have broken up.'[1]

Christendom, he concluded, was against him:

'If you barons are determined to defend the case of Hus, you will find it very difficult to go against the solid unity of the Church. For ourselves, we wish to stand by Holy Church, nor do we incline to new-fangled ideas' (*Doc.*, 613).

To this resolution, in spite of the reproaches of Hus, Sigismund kept. When, on the flight of John, 'the keys of the prison in which the Master was detained were handed over to the King, and he could now with honour have released him,' Sigismund preferred to hand Hus over to the Bishop of Constance. The bishop, 'fearing an attempt at release, for the prison of the Blackfriars was outside the walls, and the guards were few and careless,' that same night took Hus, fettered in a boat, to his own castle of Gottlieben (March 24).[2] 'There he lay in fetters in an airy tower.' He could walk about by day, but 'at night was handcuffed on his bed

[1] *Doc.*, 612. Written from Paris (March 21, 1416) in Czech, to the barons of Bohemia and Moravia.

[2] Palacky, *Gesch. Böh.*, iii. (1) 339; *Doc.*, 541; 'cum 170 fere armatis' as a guard.

to the wall.'[1] Above all, at Gottlieben Hus missed the gaoler Robert, who had formed the link with his friends outside. Not a single letter written from Gottlieben has been preserved.

This matter of the safe-conduct[2] demands, by its importance, fuller treatment. In dealing with it we must beware lest we become unjust, because of inability to recognise conditions, both of law and public opinion, which have passed away. Sigismund erred in that he issued it at all, or rather did not inform Hus of its limitations. No imperial safe-conduct could abrogate the public law of Europe, any more than the issue of a passport can give immunity from arrest to-day. All that the safe-conduct could do was to secure for Hus, both on his journey and at Constance itself, so long as he was free, the rights and privileges of the Empire and of all secular states. But there was a State in which the Emperor's writ did not run. This was the State of the Church, a State as completely distinct from and independent of the secular states as the

[1] *Doc.* 255, 541. Hus was confined in the west tower, Marmor, *op. cit.* 79 n. In the Rosengarten Museum at Constance there are relics of Hus—the block to which he was chained, and bricks from his cell at the Dominican, on which he had traced words now unintelligible (Schweinitz, 65).

[2] For a copy of the safe-conduct, see Appendix Q, p. 364.

modern empires of Europe are independent of each other. Over this State, which existed everywhere, coterminous with and yet distinct from the kingdoms of the world, secular potentates had no control, except in so far as they had secured the mastery in that large and disputed section of common interests called the temporalities of the Church. Other questions there were in dispute—wills, the law of marriage, and criminal clerks. Over these the battle between the two Empires—the Secular State and the Church—waged incessantly, with results varying with different countries.[1] But one matter was regarded throughout Europe as within the strict control of the Church, governed solely by its laws. No kingdom had yet attempted to limit the claim of the Church that to her belonged the right of hunting out and destroying heresy. With this the State must not interfere. Her sole business was to carry out the verdict, as the sheriff to-day carries out the sentence of the judge.

Again, to the people at large, as well as to thinkers like Aquinas, or saints like Louis of

[1] On this whole matter, see my *Ch. West. in M.A.*, ii. c. 4. The grasp of the medieval law system is absolutely needful for all serious students. Cf. Maitland, *Canon Law in Ch. England*, espec. 100, 50–63, and *passim*.

France, toleration of heresy was a thing unspeakable, a crime against God and nature. The Church which did not root out those who corrupted the faith whereon depended the life of the soul, was more lacking in its first duties than the State which did not hang the coiners of false money, or break murderers on the wheel.[1] This claim was not made by ecclesiastics solely: rather the duty was thrust upon the Church, with full consciousness, by civil lawyers themselves. Nine years before the Inquisition was founded, Frederic II. had made the prosecution of heresy a part of the public law of Europe.[2] In 1224 he added the penalty of death by fire. The Church hastened to approve of his legislation and embody it in her Canon Law.[3] All that Sigismund had done by his issue of a safe-conduct was to show how little he understood the limits of his own power. He had claimed for Cæsar the things which belong to God. He had ventured by his own fiat to override the recognised common law of Europe. King Ferdinand of Aragon showed a more correct appreciation of the medieval position

[1] *Ch. West.*, ii. pp. 152–5.

[2] 1220. For the decrees of Frederic, see Döberl, *Mon. Germ. Selecta*, v. 41–44; Hefele, vii. 214–9.

[3] By the Bull *Ut Inquisitionis*, c. 18, in Sexto 5, 2. Cf. Lyndwood, *Provinciale*, 293.

when he wrote to the Emperor to remonstrate with him for hesitating to punish Hus:

'I have been informed that this criminal has been for some time in your dungeons, but not tried. I marvel much, if this is so, that your Majesty has not punished one whom God has judged, as we are told by Moses, etc. . . . Therefore I beseech you that you keep the commandments of God; do not let off that criminal to persuade nations, nor allow his heresies to be publicly heard, but let him be punished at once. . . . Never can the passport (*pedagium*) granted by you free a man who was a master of errors, who has sinned much by persistent heresy, concerning which he is neither repentant nor converted, but still perseveres in his iniquity. Away with the thought. Surely he ought to be punished! There is no breaking faith with a man who has broken faith with God. Written with my own hand.[1]

Ferdinand of Aragon but voiced the general opinion. Promises made to heretics were not binding, any more than the oath of Herod to Salome. Such a promise was 'impious, for it can only be fulfilled by a crime.' Said the Council: 'By law, natural, divine, and human, no faith or promise must be kept to the prejudice of the Catholic faith.'[2] They could fall back for their justification, as we have seen Ferdinand of Aragon claimed, on the rule of Innocent III.:

[1] March 27, 1415, *Doc.*, 540–1.

[2] Gerson, *Op.*, v. 572; Hardt, iv. 521–2, Sept. 23, 1415; Lab., xvi. 291. As the words are important, we give the clause in Appendix Q, p. 365.

'According to the canons, faith is not to be kept with him who keeps not faith with God.'[1] Heresy severed every human tie—fatherhood, marriage, society—and put the heretic, as an outlaw, outside all rules of morality or codes of policy. The most striking example of this is the fact that heresy in the case of an overlord released the vassal from the most binding engagement of the Middle Ages, the oath of allegiance. As the greater includes the less, minor pledges were necessarily forfeit. Slowly but firmly the Council drove this idea into the mind of Sigismund. 'Many say,' he repeated, in his address of June 7 to Hus, 'that we cannot, under the law, give a safe-conduct to a heretic or one suspect of heresy.'[2] 'I told them,' he added, 'that I did not want to defend any heretic. If a man persisted in his heresy, I would rather with my own hands (*solus*) light the faggots and burn him.' Sigismund was naturally faithless; he was true throughout life to the motto, 'Qui nescit dissimulare, nescit regnare.'[3] The throwing Hus overboard was for him but a calculation of profit and loss. For a while pride inclined him

[1] Lea, *Hist. Inquis. in M.A.*, i. 228–9, ii. 468–70, for an important note on this declaration of Innocent.

[2] *Doc.*, 284.

[3] See his portrait, Hardt, i. Preface.

to keep his word; but self-interest triumphed. He dreaded most of all any step which might break up the Council or give John a handle against him. He had learned that to attempt to release Hus from the Inquisition would render him liable by the Bull *Ad Extirpanda*, to the forfeiture of his dominions. Such scruples as he may have had—they cannot have been many when we remember his career—would be soothed by the consciousness that for once he had had no intention to deceive, and that Hus had been betrayed not so much by the breach of his (Sigismund's) honour, as by his ignorance of legal niceties, and his powerlessness to arrange everything according to his own will. Whether in his treachery Sigismund even blushed, is a matter of warm debate.[1] Probably he was hardened against blushing by his long practice in entering into engagements which he could not fulfil. Possibly he remembered the case of his father, Charles IV., who in 1346 was released by Clement VI. from a troublesome oath. Could not the son, with the

[1] The blush of Sigismund has led to much controversy. It might be as discreditable as the falsehood itself. Alzog and other R.C. writers deny it, owing to the fact that nothing is said about it in Mladenowic's *Relatio*. But Mladenowic does give it in his brief account found in a Latin version in the *Monumenta*, ii. 344–8; cf. Hardt, iv. 393, who also quotes this source.

spiritual assistance of the Council, follow in his steps? In fact, in the case of heresy a dispensation was not even necessary.

As regards Hus, his trust in the safe-conduct was implicit. Hitherto he had refused to present himself before the Roman Court, 'because of the perils.' But with Sigismund's safe-conduct—Hus would have repudiated the idea that it was a mere passport—he felt protected. The fact that he set off without it—he would not have done this if he had considered it a passport for the journey—shows that he regarded it as a safe-conduct for Constance itself, and a promise of return.[1] In his ignorance of law, both canon and civil, he knew nothing of the real valuelessness of the paper given to him. Nevertheless, a suspicion that the only passport that could have served him would have been a passport from the Pope or Council itself seems, more than once, to have crossed his mind.[2] Nor was Hus alone in his error. In reality, Bohemia had only recently been incorporated into the Empire; she knew little of the statutes of Frederic II. and the common law of Europe. The papal Inquisition had never been established within her borders. When in 1372

[1] See *Doc.*, 70, 91, 114, 319; and for the passport theory, Appendix Q, p. 364.

[2] *Doc.*, 78, 89.

Gregory XI. set up five inquisitors for Germany, the province of Prague was pointedly omitted. Systematic persecution of heretics, and the attendant legal system, was so unfamiliar to her that Hus, and the Czechs generally, proclaimed, not once nor twice, but at every opportunity, that 'they had never known a Bohemian heretic.' In reality, as recent researches have shown, the land was swarming with Waldensians and Beghards.[1] This ignorance of the Inquisition and its methods accounts also for the indignation of Bohemia when they heard of the details and results of Hus's trial. The trial, as trials by the Inquisition went, was fair enough. But for the Czechs the whole thing was a hateful innovation, and the breach of the safe-conduct a shameless betrayal.

A minor matter still remains to be cleared up. Why, it may be asked, did the Council at one time seek to deny that Hus had a safe-conduct at all? Witnesses were brought to prove that Hus did not receive the safe-conduct until fifteen days after his arrest. The letters of Hus were twisted to the same effect. The evidence of Sigismund himself was needed to destroy this subterfuge.[2] We think the answer is twofold.

[1] *Doc.*, 53, 69; and compare Lea, ii., *Inquis.*, 427–35.

[2] *Doc.*, 89. The fact that Hus entered Constance without a passport (see *supra*, p. 274) gave some truth to the story.

In the early days, when denying the existence of the safe-conduct, the Council was not yet sure of its own position, or of the power of Sigismund. Nor should we overlook the efforts of John to embroil Council and Emperor in a dispute, from which he alone would have reaped advantage. Later on, when the Council realised its power, and had come to terms with Sigismund as against John, the denial of the safe-conduct was an effort by the Council to save the reputation of Sigismund,—we use the word to indicate not moral, but material interests,—especially in Bohemia. Sigismund, to his credit, refused to avail himself of this subterfuge of diplomacy. To his credit, also, he refused to take refuge in the plea that he had only granted the safe-conduct after receiving from the Bishop of Nazareth the certificates of Hus's orthodoxy.[1] Thereupon the Council took the line of *ultra vires*, which had been open to them from the first.

The betrayal of the safe-conduct was the end of the whole system. The sacrifice of Hus was not in vain. The public attention, the growing intelligence of Europe, was directed to, and revolted from, a condition of things which, however legal, was not natural. The New Learning was

[1] *Supra*, p. 268. See *Doc.*, 70, compared with 242; Berger, *op. cit.* 100–1.

beginning to show that rightness of conduct was something higher than rightness of belief, and depended for its sanctions upon deeper foundations than the laws of the Church. The State soon made an end of the age-long claims of the Church to an independent position in matters of law. The extravagant claims of Rome, though never formally repealed, and, for all we know, still a binding part of the Canon Law, have become obsolete and impossible. Nor was the betrayal of Hus a chapter that could be repeated. In 1437 the Council of Basel in vain attempted to induce John Rokyzana to come to the city under their safe-conduct; Sigismund in vain appealed to his 'honour.' At a later date Martin Luther told Europe the story of the great betrayal.[1] At Worms, Charles v., though urged by ecclesiastics to imitate Sigismund, wisely realised that the times were changed. The old rules of Innocent were dead; henceforth the Inquisition was forced to come out from its shelter of hypocrisy and law and fall back upon the cruelties of Alva, the massacre of St. Bartholomew's, and the bloodshed of the Thirty Years' War. From the standpoint of morals and civilisation the change was not loss.

Sigismund was not the only broken reed.

[1] See *Mon.*, i. Preface.

Early in March there had arrived in Constance the Bishop of Nazareth, from whom Hus had obtained the certificate of orthodoxy. But if the friends of the Reformer looked for assistance from his presence, they were speedily undeceived. Little did they realise the dread even of an inquisitor himself lest he should come under the charge of "fautorship" of heresy. So when arrested by D'Ailli, the bishop stated that Wenzel gave no support to 'Wyclify,' and had only sent Hus to Constance that Bohemia might 'be purged from infamy.' Thereupon Bishop "Sup-with-the-Devil," as he was called from his famous meal with Hus, slipped away home in disguise, for fear of the Wyclifists, 'inasmuch as the messenger of Satan had been changed into an angel of light.'[1]

III

In January, on his partial recovery from his first illness, Hus once more began his interrupted letters. They were passed out, in spite of the

[1] *Doc.*, 542, with Palacky's note on 'Episcopus Cumdaemone.' From the same anonymous letter (April 2, 1415) we learn of Christan Prachaticz's arrest at the suit of Michael, and his release on the intervention of Sigismund, "who had a special care for him as a learned astronomer" (Creighton, ii. 36). He departed for Prague March 18–19, 'where it is feared he will sow other lies, as is the manner of all the Wyclifists.'

vigilance of Michael's spies, by means of his Polish visitors, and by the connivance of his gaoler Robert, whom he had made his devoted servant, and for whose benefit he penned in prison several short tracts, still preserved to us: *The Lord's Prayer*, *The Ten Commandments*, *On Marriage* ('which estate, please God, Robert is shortly about to enter'), and *On Mortal Sin*. In this last he dwells much upon death:

'Let us therefore learn to live well, that we may die well. Let us therefore who wish to reign with Christ, not fear to die well for Him. For he who fears death loses the joy of life. He who fears to endure death for Christ's sake loses the gladness of life, present and future.'

A larger tract, compiled also at his gaoler's request, was his *Lord's Supper*, written for edification rather than controversy:

'There are four profound secrets of our faith: the Trinity, the foreknowledge of God, the Incarnation, and the worshipful Sacrament of the Body and Blood of Christ. . . . I beg of you not to trip me up if my quotations from the doctors are not exact, for I have no books, writing in prison.'[1]

When not at work on these tracts, or preparing his defence, Hus would sometimes spend whole nights in writing letters, many of which

[1] For these treatises, see *Mon.*, i. 29–34, 38–44; *Doc.*, 254, 93, 99. They are pleasant reading, with little distinctive except their tenderness.

fell into the hands of his enemies.[1] At other times he would scribble hexameters, with impossible abbreviations, in Latin and Czech, 'to pass the time.' They are redeemed by their unfailing courage:

> 'I leave you, friend Duba,
> My horse-cloth and bag;
> Remember me, please,
> Whene'er you eat cheese.'[2]

He wrote so much that ink and pens ran short. 'Alas, alas!' cried the priest of the Bethlehem, as he read one of Hus's letters to the congregation, and pointed to the torn scrap on which it was written—'alas, alas! Hus is running out of paper.'[3] So Hus sent Chlum a letter asking for more; also for a Vulgate and a copy of Peter Lombard's *Sentences*, for these books had been taken away from him. But of the kindness of his treatment by his gaolers, and even by the officials of the Pope, he had no complaint to make.[4] He also received many letters; these, unfortunately, he did not keep, but at once destroyed.[5]

Of the letters written by Hus in his first prison we have space for but few extracts. Choice is difficult where all the letters are of

[1] *Doc.*, 87, 88.
[2] Cf. *Doc.*, 96, 113, and for his love of song, *ibid.* 9, 137.
[3] *Doc.*, 255 n. [4] *Doc.*, 85, 87. [5] *Doc.*, 114.

interest. The first extract is from a letter written to John of Chlum:

'I passed almost the whole of last night in writing answers to the charges which Palecz has drawn up against me. He is striving hard to bring about my condemnation. God pardon him, and help me. . . . Tell Doctor Jesenic and Jerome of Prague that they must not come here on any account. I am surprised that Sigismund has forgotten me, and that he never sends me a word. Perchance I shall be condemned before I have speech with him. If that is his honour, it is his own look-out. Noble Lord John, my noble benefactor, my intrepid defender, don't be anxious either on my account or because of the losses you sustain. Almighty God will give you more than this. . . . Tell John Cardinalis to be cautious, for all the men who gave themselves out as friends were really inquisitors. . . . I am surprised that no Bohemian visits me in prison. Perhaps they are acting for the best. Let this letter be torn up at once. Send another shirt by the bearer. . . . I should at least like to speak to Sigismund once before I am condemned, for I came here at his request, and under his promise that I should return safe to Bohemia' (*Doc.*, 89–91).

Our next letter is again written to Chlum. To understand it, we must remember that Hus had adopted a novel method of advertising his creed. He had found a use for the great bare walls of the Bethlehem Chapel. On these he had painted up sundry arguments and theses, even once a long treatise.[1]

[1] *Mon.*, i. 191; cf. *Doc.*, 519, *supra*, p. 184. Hus probably copied the practice from the monastery of Königsaal, the burial-place of the Bohemian kings. There, "around the walls of

'Expound my dream last night. I dreamed that they wanted to destroy all the pictures of Christ in the Bethlehem, and they succeeded. Next morning I saw many painters at work on finer and more numerous pictures, upon which I gazed with gladness. And the painters, together with a vast crowd, were crying out: "Let the bishops come now and hurt us." Whereupon the crowd rejoiced, and I with them. And when I awoke, I found that I was laughing' (*Doc.*, 93).

This dream, as John of Chlum wrote back to explain, was more than an allegory. It was a prophecy. Only he wishes Hus would think rather about his reply to the Council than of dreams. But perhaps he is right in thus obeying the gospel command: 'It shall be given him in the same hour what he ought to say.' Hus, we may add, attached much importance to his dreams. He tells us how he dreamed of the Pope's flight before it took place, as also of the imprisonment of Jerome.[1]

In the next letters Hus is sadly depressed. Chlum tries in vain to cheer him with scraps of gossip: 'All your friends, especially Christan (Prachaticz), are most attentive to the good

the garden, the whole of the Scriptures from Genesis to Revelation was engraved, with letters enlarging in size with their distance from the ground, so that all could be easily read" (Lea, *op. cit.* ii. 432, who gives no authority for a statement that on physical grounds would seem exaggerated).

[1] *Doc.*, 110. Chlum's letter should be dated, I think, from the last clause, as February 18. See Hardt, iv. 43.

widow'—Widow Faith, of the bakehouse with the sign of the White Pigeons! But Hus will not be comforted. He misses much the Sacrament. 'But the apostles of Christ, and many other saints, were without it also in prisons and desert places. I am well,' he adds, 'but shall be better after death, if I keep the commandments of God unto the end' (*Doc.*, 96, 97).

Our next extract is from a letter written to Chlum, March 4, 1415:

'Gracious lord,—I do so rejoice in your health, your presence, and your constancy in all the toils which you have undertaken for poor me. God has sent you to me as a helper, for your gain, I hope, both in this world and in eternity. I ask you then, by the mercy of God, to await the end, like a soldier of Jesus Christ. . . . The God of all goodness at one time consoles me, at another afflicts me, but I have faith that He will never leave me in my trouble. I have been horribly troubled with stone, from which I never suffered before, and with severe vomiting and fevers. My gaolers were frightened that I should die. . . . Oh, how I should like to see you! I think, if you speak to the Pope's under-chamberlain, you may get permission. But you must be careful to talk in Latin before my guards; and in going out, your secretary will do well to give them some drink-money. . . . I will answer the accusations of Gerson if I live. If I die, God will answer them at the day of judgment. Do not trouble that expenses in Constance mount up. If God shall free "Goose" from his prison, you will not regret these expenses. Noble lord, stay till the end comes' (*Doc.*, 98, 99).

On March 20, 1415, Pope John fled from Constance. The excitement was intense No

one knew what would happen, or who was in authority. Hus was as anxious as the rest.

'My gaolers have already all fled. I have nothing to eat,[1] and I know not what will happen to me in prison. Please go with the other nobles to Sigismund, and get him to take some steps about me, lest on my account he fall into sin and confusion. Please come to me, with the other Greek nobles, for I must have a word with you. Please go to Sigismund at once; it is dangerous to wait. . . . I fear lest the master of the Pope's household shall carry me off with him to-night, for to-day he has been hanging about the monastery. . . . If you love your poor "Goose," get the king to send me guards from his own court, or to set me free from prison this very evening. Written in prison, late on Sunday night' (*Doc.*, 100; on March 24).

All this while the trial of Hus was slowly proceeding. We do not propose to go through it in any detail. There are, however, certain points which demand attention. In the first place, the student should note that it is one of the completest records we possess of a trial by the Inquisition. The secrets of this Court, as a rule, were buried in the torture chamber. We further note that for a trial by the Inquisition it was singularly just and merciful. Owing to the power of his friends, Hus was not subjected to the usual torture. He was also spared the breaking in of his spirit by confinement in some

[1] Hitherto the Pope had paid 10–12 florins a week for Hus's support. From *Doc.*, 543, we learn that on the Pope's flight provisions ran short, and continued so until after April 2nd.

oubliette. His friends had access to him. Contrary to the rules, he was even permitted to defend himself publicly in open session. D'Ailli and Zabarella made conspicuous efforts to order the trial not merely so as to obtain a conviction, —that could be taken for granted,—but to carry the judgment of Sigismund and the opinion of Bohemia. Above all, they desired rather to bring about a recantation than push measures to an extreme. The troubles in Bohemia would be at an end if Hus could be sent back penitent and humbled, bound over to preach against the doctrines he had hitherto defended. Whatever Michael the Pleader might desire, the stake formed no part of the programme of the cardinals.

To own that the trial of Hus was singularly merciful but sets forth in darker relief the horrors of a system under which thousands of victims had been tortured and broken. Heretics had no rights. Mere suspicion was itself guilt, from which the suspect must purge himself. If witnesses were found to testify to his heresy, the prisoner had no escape, unless he could show that the witnesses were his mortal enemies. As the names of the witnesses were withheld, this was difficult. In the case of Hus, some of the depositions taken by Michael the Pleader before he left Prague had by some means fallen into his

hand. For Hus, this knowledge of the names of the deponents was an unusual advantage. When at the final judgment the monstrous charge was read out that Hus claimed that he was the fourth member of the Trinity, the accused asked, in indignation, the name of the witness. This was at once refused.[1] Thus the equity of Rome allowed the enemies of years to stab in the dark. Moreover, it was against the law for any lawyer to assist a suspect. When Hus asked for an advocate, the request was refused. 'So, in the presence of the Commission, I chose God as my advocate, saying right out: "The Lord Jesus, who in a short time shall judge us all, shall be my proctor."'[2]

That the charges[3] against him were strenuously denied by Hus availed him nothing. The rule of the Inquisition was simple. If sufficient witnesses testified to guilt, the poor wretch must confess and abjure or be burned. The reward for confession was imprisonment for life, instead of the stake. In the case of Hus, though more was true than he seems to have discerned, some

[1] *Doc.*, 318. [2] *Doc.*, 253, 84, 88, 95.

[3] There were fifty-eight heads against Hus (Hardt, iv. 411–429; conveniently summarised, Hefele, vii. 194–198). These were finally reduced to thirty [Hardt, iv. 1518, 407–12; cf. *Doc.*, 225–30, 286–308. Hefele, vii. 204–5, gives a table of harmonising the numbers]. So far as true, they contain nothing save familiar positions of Wyclif.

of the charges were manifestly false. He was said to hold the errors of Wyclif concerning the Sacrament: in reality one of the few points in which he did not follow his greater master. Time after time Hus claimed that he held the full theory of transubstantiation. He even wrote in prison a tractate, *De Corpore Christi*, to prove his orthodoxy.[1] Speech and treatise were alike useless. In accordance with rule, the witnesses against him were believed, and Hus condemned for heresies he had never taught. For denial was regarded as hardness of heart, which intensified and witnessed to the prisoner's guilt.

Nor was this the final device of the system. Once condemned, Hus was informed that if he would be reconciled to the Church, he must first confess on oath that he was guilty of holding the errors imputed to him. Perjury was thus the only gateway to life.

But we are anticipating. The trial lasted for months. At first the proceedings were vigorously pushed. Immediately after his arrest, a Commission of three inquisitors—the Patriarch of Con-

[1] March 4. See *Doc.*, 99, and for the treatise, *Mon.* i. 163*a*–167*a*. For the hymn of Hus on the Eucharist, written shortly before his execution, more poetical than usual, see *Mon.*, ii. 348. For disclaimers by Hus of belief in remanence, see *Doc.*, 19, 164–5, 170, 174–85.

stantinople; Hus's courier, the Bishop of Lübeck; and Bishop Bernard of Città di Castello, who had dealt with Jerome at Cracow[1]—were appointed to examine him. By these three, 'together with their notaries and witnesses,' Hus was repeatedly visited in prison and examined. The prosecutors, Palecz and Michael, were unsparing in their labours. Palecz, 'than whom I have not found, all the days of my life, a harder comforter,' put in a list of forty-two articles, chiefly extracted from the *De Ecclesia*, 'and brought forward old conversations we had years ago.' 'A more dangerous heretic than thyself,' he said, addressing Hus as he lay on his sickbed, 'has not arisen since the birth of Christ, save only Wyclif.' 'I should be glad,' said Michael, spurring on a reluctant witness, 'to bear evidence against my own father if he was a heretic.' His spies were everywhere, 'finding out letters and other evidence.'[2]

With the coming of Sigismund the Council, in their uncertainty as to the future, offered to appoint a larger Commission of a dozen 'masters,' to settle the whole matter. Hus refused, and

[1] *Doc.*, 506.

[2] *Doc.*, 87, 92, 253, 110, 199–204 (a sort of preamble to the Commission); and for Palecz's articles, with interlinear comments by Hus, *Doc.*, 204–24.

demanded once more a hearing before the whole assembly.[1] His enemies told him: 'no audience could be granted unless I first pay down 2000 ducats to the ministers of Antichrist for expenses.' The Commission pleaded, as the excuse, that he 'had 70,000 florins,' at anyrate 'the barons of Bohemia had it in trust for him.' 'What has become,' asked Michael, 'of that robe full of florins?'[2]

With the outbreak of the conflict between John and the Council, the trial of Hus was suspended. Interest was necessarily transferred elsewhere. But after the deposition of the Pope, there was once more leisure for the heretic. The Council was profoundly unconscious of the bitter contrast its procedure would present to history.

[1] *Doc.*, 86, 89, written in January. We have only Hus's statement of this proposal. I am inclined to think he has wrongly reported it. Matters of inquisition were not usually handed over to 'masters.' The offer, whatever it was, was probably due to the Council's uncertainty. It is impossible to take it as an offer to allow twelve masters to plead for him (as Wylie, *C.C.*, 148), a thing the Inquisition would never allow, nor over this would the Commissioners have been 'instantes per plures dies.' Possibly there is some confusion with the Commission of twelve that, according to Cerretanus (Hardt, iv. 23), was appointed to try Hus on Dec. 1, one of whom was 'Minoritanæ familiæ Magister. Quibus adjuncti sunt alii six viri doctissimi,' a reference otherwise not without difficulties of its own.

[2] *Doc.*, 87, 92.

They had condemned the Pope for the foulest of crimes. According to their own showing, whatever be its worth, John XXIII. was scarcely fit to live.[1] His punishment was a trifling term of imprisonment and a later reward. Hus was acknowledged even by his enemies to be a man illustrious for his virtues. He had, however, dared to follow one who thought for himself. His very virtues but made it the more needful that he should be burnt. Revolt against its system was the one crime for which the medieval Church had no pardons to sell.

On April 6th, the uncertainties caused by the flight of John being now at an end, a new Commission was appointed, with D'Ailli at the head, to examine the heresies of Wyclif and Hus.[2] But D'Ailli was too busy to give the needed attention,[3] so on the 17th the matter was transferred to another committee of four. On May 4th they brought in an interim report. Wyclif was con-

[1] Cf. the sarcastic comments of Hus, *Doc.*, 125, 134, and of Jakoubek of Mies, *ibid.* 558.

[2] Lab., xvi. 75; Hardt, iv. 99–100.

[3] Lab., xvi. 80; Hardt, iv. 118. The English delegate of the new committee is variously named William Coru (Hardt, iv. 118), Cotu and Comes (Lab., xvi. 95, evident misreadings), and William Gorach (Lab., xvi. 80). Dacher's list (Hardt, v. 24) is too incomplete to help us. Wylie, *C.C.*, 150, identifies him with William Gray, vice-chancellor of Oxford, 1439.

demned on no less than 260 different counts. His writings were ordered to be burnt, 'his bones to be dug up and cast out of the consecrated ground, provided they could be identified from those of Christians buried near.'[1]

The condemnation of Wyclif practically sealed the fate of Hus, though, for technical reasons connected with the absence of a Pope, formal judgment was allowed to stand over. In spite of the protestations of Hus, the Council was correct in identifying his position with that of the great English Reformer. The teaching of Hus, especially his deductions from the doctrine of predestination, would have shattered the foundations of the medieval Church. Hus really left no place for the Hildebrandine Papacy. He had called the Pope, Antichrist. For years he had disregarded the papal excommunication. He had pleaded for the right of the State to control the priest, and to take away at will the endowments of erring clerks. To crown all, he had encouraged revolt by writing from prison to Jakoubek of Mies in favour of communion in both

[1] Hardt, iv. 149–157; Lab., xvi. 123; *Doc.*, 569; Brown, *Fascic.*, i. 266–95. The real stress was, however, laid by the Council on the famous forty-five articles. A 'brief censure' by the Council is in Hardt, iii. 168–211, a 'diffusa condemnatio,' *ibid.* 212–335, of value for the study of Wyclif.

kinds. His whole life, viewed from the standpoint of men like Gerson or D'Ailli, was an effort to produce reform by methods of revolution, in their opinion more dangerous than the errors themselves. For the abuses damned only the individual; revolution was the destruction of the Ark of the Lord and of Society itself.

The encouragement by Hus of communion in both kinds introduced a new question into his trial. The refusal of the cup to the laity was originally a Manichæan heresy, and as such was condemned by Leo the Great and Gelasius I. That the condemnation still held good in the twelfth century is evidenced by Gratian's incorporation in his *Decretum* of Gelasius's decretal, a fact which Hus was not slow to point out. But with the growth of the dogma of transubstantiation, there arose numerous regulations to prevent the careless handling of the elements, the dropping of crumbs, the spilling of wine, or the leaving the Blood upon the lips.[1] To prevent this last, the custom grew of dipping the host in the wine and water, an innovation only suppressed with

[1] Andrew Brod enlarges on these (Hardt, iii. 392–415, espec. 406–9). Note 407, 'Multo major poena debetur laicis, barbas, pepla aut vestem perfundentibus sanguine Christi, et debent cum barba cremari et in infernum poni,' which ought not to be translated (as Lea, ii. 474) that the layman should be burned with his beard.

difficulty in the eleventh and twelfth centuries. Gradually the custom spread of administering the wafer only. But as yet there was no law; the matter was simply a usage, founded, we may grant, upon excessive veneration. The authority lacking in the Scriptures was supplied by the logic of Thomas Aquinas, whose dialectics demonstrated that Body and Blood were both contained in the wafer.

The matter was clearly a test case. Scripture and the authority of the early Church were acknowledged to be against the practice. But Rome rallied all her forces to the defence of her customs. She realised correctly that the attempt to judge the developments of sacerdotalism by early usage or an appeal to the Scriptures was fatal to her claims. So for more than a century she urged unsparing warfare against the Bohemian Utraquists. On June 15, 1415, the Council of Constance unanimously ordered all priests who administered the cup to be handed over to the secular arm as heretics. Henceforth the claim of the cup by the laity was a heresy that could only be purged out by fire (Hardt, iv. 334).

In Bohemia the matter had been first raised by Mathias of Janow.[1] On his allowing the

[1] The evidence for Janow is very doubtful. See Wratislaw, *J. Hus*, 64–5 ; Pal. *Ges.*, iii. (1) 332–6.

question to drop, it remained in abeyance until the arrest of Hus. A certain Peter of Dresden, a Waldensian school teacher in Prague, then suggested to Jakoubek of Mies—who had succeeded Michael the Pleader as vicar of St. Adalbert's—that he should return to the early custom of the Church.[1] This Jakoubek proceeded to do, not only in his own church but in others.[2] As the Wyclifists were, however, somewhat divided on the subject, Jakoubek wrote to Hus at Constance. Chlum also asked him, 'kindly to write down on this sheet your final views, that it may be shown at the right time to the friends.'[3] Hitherto, as his treatise *De Sanguine Christi*[4] shows, Hus had shown little interest in the matter. He now

[1] Æn. Sylv. *Hist. Boh.*, c. 35; cf. *Chron. Procop.*, 72, in Höfler, *Ges.*, i. 67–76.

[2] Names of Jakoubek's allies given, *Doc.*, 178.

[3] *Doc.*, 86. This letter must be dated before Jan. 8. See *supra*, p. 282 n. For other references by Hus, see *Doc.*, 91.

[4] *Mon.*, i. 42–4, 'written at Constance before he was thrown into prison,' and, as the copious extracts show, before his books were taken away. But in his *De Cœna Domini*, *supra*, *Mon.*, i. 38–41, Hus practically concedes the Roman position. For the history of the withdrawal of the cup, see Lea, *op. cit.* ii. 471–5. The controversies of Jakoubek with Andrew Brod and others are given at length in Hardt, iii. 335–933. They show Jakoubek to be an acute and well-read debater. For the other side the student should at least read Gerson's reply, 'written in 1417 by order of the Council' (Hardt, iii. 766–80; Lab., xvi. 1202–9).

replied that the gospels and customs of the primitive Church were both in its favour. His letter fell into the hands of Michael, and served as further evidence that Hus was a dangerous revolutionist. Michael, in fact, had only anticipated events when he had accused Hus of Utraquism in the previous November (*Doc.*, 194).

IV

The Commission appointed by the Council to try Hus was expressly authorised to proceed to final sentence.[1] With the presentation of their decision in the ordinary course, nothing further would have been heard of the prisoner of the Inquisition. Hus would have been left to rot in his dungeon until his spirit was broken, or the time convenient for an *auto da fe*. But the friends of Hus were resolved to give publicity to the trial. A week after the Commission had brought in its report, the Czechs and Poles showed how little they understood the procedure of the Inquisition by handing in a protest, drawn up by Peter Mladenowic, against the imprisonment of Hus without trial or conviction. They enlarged once more on the safe-conduct. They also protested against the rumour, started by the

[1] Hardt, iv. 118. There is, however, some doubt as to the reading.

Bishop of Leitomischl, that in Bohemia shoemakers were consecrating the elements, and 'the sacrament of the most precious Blood carried about in flasks' to private houses. The Council replied (May 16) that as far back as 1411 Hus had been tried and condemned. As for his pretended safe-conduct, it was only obtained by his friends fifteen days after his arrest. The Czechs, still unconscious of the real drift of events, twice again[1] presented their petitions, urging for Hus a speedy public hearing, putting in the discredited certificates of the Bishop of Nazareth. Hus, they pleaded, 'should be released from his chains, and put into the care of some bishop, that he might recruit his strength' and so prepare for his trial. In Bohemia the mutterings of the coming storm could already be heard. Two assemblies in May, at Brünn and Prague, of the nobles of Bohemia and Moravia despatched to Sigismund, as the heir to the throne, a warning, 'strengthened by 250 seals,' to release 'the beloved master and Christian preacher' from further imprisonment, and send him back to Bohemia after first granting him a public hearing. To please Sigismund this last was finally granted. That there should be no mistake as to its real meaning, the Council sent a deputation

[1] May 18; May 31.

to Hus to inform him of the thirty articles which had been proved against him. A few days later, for the convenience of this trial, Hus was brought back in chains to Constance and lodged in a tower adjoining the Franciscan convent[1] (June 5).

The change was a relief; at anyrate Hus found opportunity, for the first time since March 24, to communicate with his friends.

'Lord John, most gracious and faithful *fautor*,[2] God reward you! Please don't leave me until you see the end. But I would rather that you saw me led to the fire than thus miserably stifled. . . . I know not who will pay my friends what they have lost, except it be the Lord Jesus Christ. I could wish that some of the richer would pay the poorer. But I fear lest the proverb will be again fulfilled: "Out of sight, out of mind"' (*Doc.*, 102).

In a second letter he dwells much on the miracles of deliverance—Lazarus, Jonah, Daniel, and Susanna.

'The Lord is with me as a strong warrior. The Lord is my light and my salvation: of whom shall I be afraid? At these times I often sing to Him the response: "Lord, I suffer violence; answer Thou for me!"' (*Doc.*, 103).

---

[1] *Doc.*, 256–72, 547–555; Hardt, iv. 189, 209, 212–13, 288–90, 296, 306. For the Franciscan convent, see Marmor, *op. cit.* 80 n. See *supra*, p. 197 n. The guide-books confuse it with the Dominican.

[2] It is difficult to say whether this word should be translated, or whether Hus is quoting a charge of "fautorship"—a technical term with the Inquisition—brought against Chlum, who certainly had rendered himself liable to it.

To Mladenowic, to whom others beside Hus owe much gratitude, he wrote:

'If Lord John Chlum meets with any loss on my behalf, dear Peter, when you return home, see to it, as also in the case of my other friends whom my pupil knows about. If I have any horse left, with a car, it ought to be Chlum's. As for you, Master Martin, if he is alive, will give you a portion of the small sum I left with him. Please do not look on it as payment for your fervent and faithful love of the truth, or for your service and consolation of me in my troubles. For this, God will be your wages, for I have nothing whereby to reward you. If I ever see Prague again, you shall share everything with me like my own brother; but I do not want to return unless it be the will of God. Dispose of my books according to the instructions I gave to Master Martin, and please select for yourself some works of Wyclif. My chief distress is over our brethren, who I imagine will suffer persecution, unless the Lord lay bare His arm. I fear that many will be offended.'[1]

When the hour of persecution came, the Bohemian brethren were more steadfast than Hus anticipated. Chlum, alas! ere he left Constance, was forced to recant.[2]

'Revile him not—the Tempter hath
A snare for all;
And pitying tears—not scorn and wrath,—
Befit his fall.'

Let us remember rather what Hus wrote to him: 'Dear friend in God, faithful and steadfast knight, may the King, not of Hungary but of

[1] *Doc.*, 103, 104.

[2] July 1, 1416, *Chron. Glassberger* (Lea, *Inquis.*, ii. 505).

heaven, give you an everlasting reward for all your faithful toil in my behalf.'[1]

On June 5 a congregation of the Council was held in the refectory of the Franciscan convent. The intention was to satisfy Sigismund by a public condemnation, but in the absence of Hus himself. So the customary psalms were read, and the articles of heresy formally presented. An attempt was then made to deprive Hus of the grace of recantation, by the putting in of the letter which he had left at Prague (*supra*, p. 271). Before this could be carried through, Mladenowic stirred up Chlum and Duba to hasten to Sigismund. The Emperor despatched Lewis the Count Palatine and the burggrave Frederic of Nuremberg with orders that nothing should be done until Hus himself was present; while the friends of Hus, to prevent forgery, put in genuine copies of his works, on the condition that they should be restored to them. So Hus had at length his desire and stood before his enemies. Very different was the reality to his dreams. Instead of an oration before a listening senate, he was met, when he attempted to explain, with angry shouts: 'Have done with your sophistries,' 'say yes or no!' If he remained silent, they clamoured that he consented. As

[1] *Doc.*, 111. Meaning missed, Neander, x. 461.

the tumult grew, the trial was adjourned and Hus removed. 'Do not fear for me,' he said, as he grasped the hands of his friends. As they watched him climb the steps of the prison they saw him smile, as if in gladness after his mockery, and hold out a hand as if blessing the people.[1] 'God Omnipotent,' he wrote, that same evening,

'gave me to-day a heart of courage, of strength. Two articles are now struck out. I hope, by the grace of God, that more will be struck out. They were crying out against me like the Jews against Jesus. . . . You made a mistake in putting in the tract *Against a Secret Adversary* along with the *De Ecclesia*. Put in nothing except the treatises against Stanislas and Palecz. . . . The nobles did well to demand that my works should be restored to them, for some were calling out "let it be burnt," especially Michael the Pleader, whom I heard. I do not think I have in the whole company of the clergy a single friend except "The Father," and a Polish doctor whom I do not know' (*Doc.*, 105).

On the 7th he was again brought before the Council. This time Sigismund was present, so better order was maintained and more freedom given to the accused. He was first charged with holding Wyclif's doctrine of remanence. This Hus denied. D'Ailli then went off into an argument to prove that Hus, as a Realist, was driven into remanence. Hus listened in patience; but when an Englishman took up the same tale, he burst out: 'This is the logic of school lads.' But another

[1] *Doc.*, 275–6.

Englishman had the courage to declare: 'Hus is right. What have these quibbles to do with a matter of faith?'

Zabarella then pointed out the number and standing of the witnesses against him. Hus replied that his witnesses were God and his conscience. 'We cannot,' retorted D'Ailli, 'give our verdict according to your conscience, but according to the evidence.' Hus had maintained that he was accused by his enemies, one of the few pleas to which the Inquisition ever attached importance. To this D'Ailli now turned:

'You say that you suspect Palecz. Palecz has behaved with the greatest kindness. He has extracted the articles in a milder way than they are contained in your book. You go so far as to call the Chancellor of Paris your enemy, than whom you cannot find in all Christendom a more renowned doctor.'

One by one the old controversies and disputes were brought into court—the forty-five articles, the burning of the books, the expulsion of the Germans, and the rest. The day ended with some plain advice from Sigismund: 'I counsel you fling yourself wholly on the grace of the Council; the quicker the better, lest you fall into a worse plight.'[1] Hus was then removed to the prison. In it lay now also his old friend Jerome.

Two letters written the same evening give

[1] For the trial of June 7, see *Doc.*, 276–85.

vivid glimpses of the trial. Hus wrote, he said, 'for a memorial of the truth, lest after his death Christ's faithful should hear scandal, and judge him to be an obstinate heretic.'

'An English doctor got up to carry on the discussion, but at once broke down. He was followed by another Englishman, a man who had come to me privately and said that Wyclif wanted to destroy all learning. So he rose up and began to discuss the muliplication of the body of Christ in the host, but broke down also. When told to be silent, he called out: "This fellow is deceiving the Council; the Council must take care that it is not deceived." When he was silenced, another one began a noisy speech on the creation of the common essence. The crowd yelled him down. But I stood up and asked that he might be heard. "You have argued well," I said to him; "I will gladly answer you." But he broke down, so added in a temper: "This is a heresy." How great was then the clamour, catcallings, and blasphemy in the assembly, Chlum, and Peter Mladenowic, his secretary, know, brave soldiers and lovers of the truth of God. So I, being often overwhelmed by such brawlings, said: "I thought in the Council there would be greater reverence, piety, and discipline." Then they all heard me, for Sigismund commanded silence.'[1]

After a night of sleepless pain, 'toothache, vomiting, headache, and stone,' Hus was brought up for his final hearing. Sigismund once more was present. Thirty-nine articles, extracted from his *De Ecclesia* and other works, were presented

[1] *Doc.*, 106–8; cf. 139, 282. This incident is usually assigned, following Hardt, iv. 307, to the first day. But Sigismund was not present on the first day.

against him, and Hus was allowed to make his limitations and exceptions. One work was not in evidence. 'I am glad,' wrote Hus that morning, 'that the *Secret Adversary*[1] is hidden.' Other charges were introduced—his sermons to the laity against scandalous priests, and especially his celebration of the sacraments while still under excommunication. When Hus owned to this last, Zabarella made a sign to the notary that special record should be made. On the whole, the trial was kept well in hand, in spite of the temptation of side issues. One interlude, however, is historical. Hus was defending the famous tenet of Wyclif: 'If a pope, bishop, or prelate is in mortal sin, then he is not a pope, bishop, or prelate.' He incautiously added that it applied to temporal rulers: 'a king in mortal sin is not really a king in the sight of God.' Sigismund was leaning at that moment out of one of the windows, telling Frederic of Nuremberg 'that in all Christendom there was not a greater heretic than Hus.' The Council saw their opportunity. 'Call the King,' shouted the prelates; 'bring him here, for this matter concerns him.' 'John Hus,' said Sigismund with dignity, when Hus had repeated his statement, 'no one lives without sin.' 'It is

[1] Finished Feb. 10, 1411. In *Mon.*, i. 135–143. Its whole argument exalts the secular head over the priests.

not enough for you,' said D'Ailli, 'that you try by your writings and teachings to decry and overthrow the spiritual estate, you now wish to hurl down the throne and royal power.' Hus tried to turn the tide by asking: 'If John XXIII. was truly Pope, why was he deposed?' 'Baldassarre,' answered Sigismund, 'was truly Pope, but was deposed from the Papacy on account of his notorious crimes.' Hus then fell back on a fine distinction between 'quoad meritum' and 'quoad officium,' and the arguments drifted off to the illustrations of Judas and Pope Joan.

At length D'Ailli summed up the decision of the Council. Hus must publicly recant and abjure. 'I am prepared,' answered Hus, 'to obey the Council, and to be taught; but I beseech you, in the name of God, do not lay snares of damnation for me by compelling me to tell a lie, and abjure articles I never held.' As he spoke of his conscience, many mocked. 'Did your conscience,' they cried, 'ever teach you that you had erred?' 'A fat priest, sitting in the window in a splendid garment, called out that he ought not to be allowed to abjure. If he retract, he will not mean it.' But Sigismund pleaded with Hus, and asked wherein lay his difficulty in retracting errors that on his own showing he was unwilling to hold. 'That, my lord king,' answered Hus, 'is not what

they mean by abjuring.' After a further warning from Sigismund, 'I stand,' replied Hus, 'at the judgment-seat of God, who will judge us all according to our merits.'

As Hus was led back to prison, Chlum managed to grasp his hand, 'though now rejected by all.' Sigismund, on his part, addressed the assembly:

'One only of the charges proved against Hus would suffice for his condemnation. If, therefore, he be unwilling to abjure and preach against his errors, let him be burnt, or do with him according to your laws. . . . Wherever his disciples be found, let the bishops tear them up root and branch. Make an end, therefore, of his secret disciples. I have to go away soon, so begin with that fellow—what's his name?' 'Jerome,' they shouted. 'Yes, Jerome. I was a boy when this sect first started in Bohemia. See what it has grown into now' (*Doc.*, 314–5).

This speech, duly reported by the listening Chlum and Mladenowic, cost Sigismund years of warfare and the crown of Bohemia. This hounding on of the Council, to the breach of his own safe-conduct, was never forgiven.

The student should understand clearly the ground, which Sigismund did not see, whereon Hus was executed. Hus was a martyr not so much to his convictions of the untruth of current beliefs, as because of his fidelity to conscience. As regards his heresies, he was, he said, willing to abjure.[1] Without the individuality of Wyclif, he

[1] *Doc.*, *passim*, *e.g.* 308, 310.

was also without Wyclif's clear conception of the value of the individual judgment. He expressly yielded himself, not once nor twice only, to the teaching of the Church. But he could not acknowledge that he recanted heresies which he had always stoutly disclaimed. For Hus truth was supreme: 'I have said that I would not, for a chapel full of gold, recede from the truth.' 'I know,' he had written in 1412, 'that the truth stands and is mighty for ever, and abides eternally, with whom there is no respect of persons.' Throughout his letters his chief anxiety is 'lest liars should say that I have slipped back from the truth I preached.' Few scenes in history are more touching or ennobling than the fidelity with which Hus refused to swerve from absolute truth, even to save his life.[1]

For a month after his trial the struggle went on. Sigismund and the Council were both anxious to obtain a professed penitent whom they could reduce to powerlessness. For this end they exhausted the resources of casuistry. One learned doctor went so far as to plead,

'If the Council told you, "You have only one eye," although you have two, you ought to agree with the Council that it is so. I answered: "If the whole world told me so, so long as I have

[1] *Doc.*, 184, 88; *Mon.*, i. 106; Lützow, *Bohemia*, 137; and for similar case of English Templars, Lea, ii. 487 n.

the use of my reason, I could not say it without injury to conscience." The doctor, after some further conversation, gave up his illustration' (*Doc.*, 103).

An Englishman urged the example of Repyngdon, Flemyng, and other Wyclifists, all of whom had recanted.[1] Another argued that if he was innocent, confession of guilt would only be a greater proof of humility, and furbished up the example of a monk condemned for incontinence. One eminent member of the Council did his best to draft a form of recantation which should meet Hus's scruples, and yet be in accord with the rules of the Inquisition: 'Dearest and most cherished brother,' he pleaded,

'do not let this disturb you, that you will condemn the truth. You will not condemn it, but your superiors. Do not lean on your own judgment, then. There are many learned and conscientious men in the Council. The perjury, if such there be, will fall on them, not on you. . . . I write briefly because I write to a wise man . . . remember Paul was let down in a basket that he might gain an advantage.'

Hus, however, refused 'the basket.' 'I will not,' he said, 'to escape a short pain, fall into greater confusion.'[2] To all such pleadings Hus had but

[1] *Doc.*, 136; Vol. i. c. 5, § 1.

[2] See the interesting correspondence of Hus and "Pater," *Doc.*, 121-3. Who "Pater" was cannot now be ascertained. Luther believed that he was the Cardinal of Ostia, Broglie, the head of the Council. This is not possible; see the reference to him, *supra*, p. 316.

one answer. He would swear that he never held or taught the heresies imputed to him, and that he would never hold or teach them. He could not forswear errors he never held, or false interpretations he abhorred.[1] Said Hus to Palecz:

'"Come, give me your counsel. What would you do if you knew for certain that you did not hold errors ascribed to you? Would you be willing to abjure?" Palecz answered: "It is a difficulty," and began to weep' (*Doc.*, 129).

Hus remained firm. 'Know,' he wrote to the University of Prague on June 27, 'that I have revoked nothing, abjured nothing.'[2] He had, in fact, hardened in his opposition. He called the decree of the Council against the cup a mad denial of the gospel of Christ, and wrote to his successor at the Bethlehem urging him to fling in his lot with the Utraquists.[3]

The letters of Hus during that last month will ever rank among the world's treasures. If Hus added nothing to our intellectual heritage, he enriched for ever our moral outlook. "Read this," said Luther, "and rejoice":

'Michael the Pleader, poor fellow, has often come to my prison with the deputies of the four nations. When I was engaged with the deputies he said to the guards, "By the grace of God we shall soon burn the heretic, on whose account I have

[1] *Doc.*, 127, 136, 142.
[2] *Ibid.* 142.
[3] *Ibid.* 126, 128.

spent many florins." But in writing this, know that I do not want vengeance on him. This I leave to God. I pray for him rather, with all my heart.

'Be prudent over my letters. Michael has given orders that no one is to be allowed in the prison, not even the wives of the gaolers. . . . God Almighty will strengthen the hearts of His faithful ones, whom He chose before the foundation of the world, that they may receive an incorruptible crown. And though Antichrist rage as he will, he shall not prevail against Christ, who shall kill him with the breath of His mouth. . . .

'I am greatly consoled by that saying in Christ: "Blessed are ye when men shall hate you." . . . A good, nay the best, of greetings, but difficult, I do not mean to understand, but to live up to, for it bids us rejoice in these tribulations. . . . It is easy to read it aloud and expound it, but difficult to live out. Even that bravest Soldier, though He knew that He should rise again on the third day, after supper was depressed in spirit. . . . On this account the soldiers of Christ, looking to their leader, the King of Glory, have had a great fight. They have passed through fire and water, yet have not perished, but have received the crown of life, that glorious crown which the Lord, I firmly believe, will grant to me—to you also, earnest defenders of the truth, and to all who steadfastly love the Lord Jesus. . . . O most holy Christ, draw me, weak as I am, after Thyself, for if Thou dost not draw us we cannot follow Thee. Strengthen my spirit, that it may be willing. If the flesh is weak, let Thy grace prevent us; come between and follow, for without Thee we cannot go for Thy sake to cruel death. Give me a fearless heart, a right faith, a firm hope, a perfect love, that for Thy sake I may lay down my life with patience and joy. Amen. Written in prison in chains on the eve of St. John the Baptist' (*Doc.*, 129–131, June 23).

On June 25 Palecz once more came to see him. Hus begged his pardon for any hard adjectives he had thrown at him in their con-

troversies. He further begged that as Palecz had been his chief enemy, he might now act as his confessor, a request which was, however, refused. But a monk shrived him, mercifully abstaining from much exhortation, and even from exacting formal proofs of penitence, an act of clemency or neglect so unusual that it is difficult to understand.[1]

On June 29 Hus wrote his last letters. In the letter to Chlum there is no hesitation or fear. The bitterness of death is overpast; Jesus, at any-rate, will 'keep His promises, nor deceive any by safe-conducts.'[2]

'He who serves Christ, as Gregory has said, will have Christ in the Fatherland of heaven as his servant. "Blessed is that servant whom his Lord welcometh," etc. The kings of the earth do not act thus with their servants. They only care for them so long as they are useful to them. Not thus Christ, the King of Glory. . . . The apostles Peter and Paul[3] have now passed their trials and torments; for them remains the life of rest, without suffering, and bliss without measure. Now they are with the choirs of angels, now they see the King in His beauty. . . . May these glorious martyrs, thus united with the King of Glory, deign to intercede for us, that, strengthened by their help, we may be partakers in their glory, by patiently suffering whatever God Almighty shall deem best for us.'

To Duba he writes in a different strain. He is delighted to hear of his approaching marriage.

[1] *Doc.*, 136. [2] *Ibid.* 143.
[3] June 29 is their festival. Hence the allusion.

May it lead him to flee the vanities of this world.

'And in fact it is time, for he has for a long time ridden to and fro through the countries, broken lances, wearied his body, spent his money, and offended his soul. Let him now remain at home in peace with his wife and serve God' (*Doc.*, 146).

His farewell letter is for his friends in Bohemia.

'God be with you, and deign to bestow upon you the eternal reward for the great kindness you have lavished upon me, and still lavish, though perchance when you receive this I shall be dead. Do not allow the Lord of Chlum, faithful knight and my kind friend, to get into any danger. . . . I beseech you, live a good life and obey God. Pray God for me, in whose gracious presence we shall soon meet through His help. I write this in fetters in prison, in expectation of death.

MASTER HUS, a servant of God in hope.

'*P.S.*—Peter, dearest friend, keep my fur cloak in memory of me.

Master Christan, faithful and beloved friend, God be with you.

Master Martin, my disciple, remember the things I have faithfully taught you.

Master Nicholas, study the Word of God.

Priest Gallus, preach the Word.

I beseech you all, persevere in the truth of God.'[1]

The month of grace would probably have been further protracted had not the departure of Sigismund for his meeting with Benedict (*supra*, p. 233) imposed a time limit. On July 1 a

[1] *Doc.*, 147, 148.

deputation of prelates endeavoured once more to persuade him that he could reasonably recant. On July 5 Zabarella and D'Ailli offered to allow him to deny the heresies proved by witnesses, provided he would abjure the list of heresies extracted from his writings. As Hus maintained that the majority of these last were 'falsely extracted,' errors he never held, he once more refused. Later in the day Sigismund sent Chlum and Wenzel of Duba, with four bishops, among them the English Hallum, to ask him finally whether he would persevere or recant. 'Master John,' said Chlum,

'we are laymen, and cannot advise you. Consider, however, and if you realise that you are guilty over any of the charges, do not be ashamed to receive instruction, and recant. But if you do not feel guilty, do not force your conscience, nor lie before God, but rather stand fast to the death in the truth which you know' (*Doc.*, 316 ; cf. 560).

Hus replied, with tears, that he would willingly revoke anything in which he could be *proved* to have erred. The bishops pronounced him obstinate in his heresy, and retired to make preparations for the final scene.

At six o'clock the next morning Hus was brought to the cathedral. While mass was sung, he was kept waiting outside the door ; this over, he was placed in the middle of the aisle.

The Bishop of Lodi preached the customary sermon on the danger of heresy and the duty of destroying it. The events of that day, said the preacher, would win for Sigismund immortal glory:

'O King, a glorious triumph is awaiting you; to you is due the everlasting crown and a victory to be sung through all time, for you have bound up the bleeding Church, removed a persistent Schism, and uprooted the heretics. Do you not see how lasting will be your fame and glory? For what can be more acceptable to God than to uproot a Schism and destroy the errors among the flock.'[1]

Then the representatives of the nations read aloud the sentence of the Council. When Hus attempted to reply, D'Ailli ordered him to be silenced. So he knelt once more in prayer: 'Lord Jesus, pardon all my enemies, for Thy great mercy's sake, I beseech Thee.' Afterwards he was placed on a platform and clad by seven bishops in the full vestments of a celebrant; then one by one they were stripped off him. A dispute arose over his tonsure; should it be cut with scissors or a razor? 'See,' said Hus, turning

[1] Lodi was the usual orator on big occasions. He preached the sermon before the Conclave (Nov. 8, 1417), on the text 'Eligite Meliorem.' *Mutatis mutandis* it would preach well to-day (Lab., xvi. 383–94). But his sermons at the condemnation of Hus and Jerome are without feeling. See *Mon.*, i. 26–27; Lab., xvi. 1323–6; Hardt, iii. 55; Lab., xvi. 1349–60.

to Sigismund, 'these bishops cannot even agree over their blasphemy.' A paper crown a yard high, with three demons painted on it 'clawing his soul with their nails,' and the word "Heresiarch," was then fastened on his head. 'The crown which my Redeemer wore,' said Hus, 'was heavier and more painful than this.' 'We commit thy soul to the devil,' sang the priests, as they handed him over to the secular arm. 'But he, with clasped hands and upturned eyes: "I commit it to the most gracious Lord Jesus."' By a strange oversight the Council forgot to add the solemn adjuration to the secular arm to shed no blood.[1] 'Go, take him,' said Sigismund, turning to Lewis the Count Palatine.[2] The count handed him over to the magistrates, who at once led him out to die, escorted by 1000 armed men and a vast crowd of spectators. But at the Geltinger Thor they found the way barred; the magistrates feared, says Reichental, 'lest the drawbridge should break.'

[1] Hardt, iv. 389–96, and Mladenowic at anyrate give none. Reichental gives one, but his narrative is not always reliable. This master-stroke of hypocrisy was, however, rarely omitted.

[2] There is considerable confusion in the MSS. over this name. For 'Clementis filius' (Hardt, iv. 448 *et passim*) read 'Clem filius,' *i.e.* son of Klemm = 'Smith-vice,' the nickname of his father, the anti-Kaiser Rupert (cf. *Doc.*, 321, 323).

As he passed through the churchyard, Hus saw a bonfire of his books.[1] He laughed, and told the bystanders not to believe the lies circulated about him. On arriving at the execution-ground, familiarly known as "the Devil's Place,"[2] Hus kneeled and prayed 'with a joyful countenance.' The paper crown fell off, and he smiled. 'Put it on again wrong way up,' cried the mob, 'that he may be burnt with the devils he has served.' His hands were tied behind his back, and Hus fastened to the stake. 'Turn him round towards the West,' cried the crowd; 'he is a heretic: he must not face the East.' This done, a rusty chain was wound round his neck, and two faggots placed under his feet. Reichental offered to call a priest. 'There is no need,' replied Hus; 'I have no mortal sin.' For the last time the marshal of the Empire asked him if he would recant and save his life. Said Hus:

'God is my witness that the evidence against me is false. I have never thought nor preached save with the one intention of winning men, if possible, from their sins. In the truth of the gospel I have written, taught, and preached; to-day I will gladly die' (*Doc.*, 323).

[1] Among them the *Exposition of the Psalms* (*Mon.*, ii. 229–339), delivered by Hus before the University in 1404.

[2] For the place of his death,—where now is the granite monument,—see Hefele, vii. 212–3.

So they heaped the straw and wood around him, and poured pitch upon it. When the flames were lighted,

'he sang twice, with a loud voice: "Christ, Thou Son of the Living God, have mercy upon me." When he began the third clause: "Who was conceived of the Virgin Mary," the wind blew the flames in his face. So, as he was praying, moving his lips and head, he died in the Lord.'

The beadles piled up the fuel, 'stirred up the bones with sticks, split up the skull, and flung it back into the flames, together with his coat and shoes,' which the count bought from the executioner, 'lest the Bohemians should keep them as relics.' The ashes were then heaped in a barrow and tilted into the Rhine.[1]

[1] Cf. the similar story of Wyclif, Vol. i. p. 245. There are several accounts of the last scenes, all of them in substantial agreement. The chief is Mladenowic's *Relatio* (*Doc.*, 316–24). Add also the narrative of another disciple, John Barbatus, *Doc.*, 556–8; the anonymous, *Doc.*, 559–61 (written July 7); the narratives in Reichental (four illustrations (Wolf)—two of his degradation); the documents in Hardt, iv. p. 447–50; the narrative in *Mon.*, ii. 344–48. This last was probably written by Mladenowic. Popular accounts were numerous, *e.g. Mon.*, ii. 363*a*; Sagan, 107; Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 306–8; Vrie in Hardt, i. (1) 201. The 'Sancta Simplicitas' story popularised by Luther (*Mon.* i.) rests on no evidence, and is at variance with the actual framework of the execution. For the supposed prophecies of Hus, see Appendix R, p. 365.

V

Jerome of Prague still remained to be dealt with. On hearing at Prague of the rupture between John and the Council, he had hastened to Constance, in spite of the express wish of Hus to the contrary.[1] There, on April 4th, he posted a notice on the walls affirming the orthodoxy of Hus. This done, he deemed it wiser to withdraw to Ueberlingen, whence he wrote to the Council asking for a safe-conduct. On April 7th he once more returned to Constance, and affixed another address to Sigismund and the Council on the doors of the Cathedral.[2] He had come, he said, of his own free will to answer all accusations of heresy. But two days later he changed his mind and slipped away from the city, in his haste leaving his sword behind him in his lodgings in the St. Paulgasse. He fled towards Bohemia, but at Hirsau was betrayed into an argument, in which he called the Council a synagogue of Satan. This led to his arrest (April 24). On the discovery, from his papers, of his identity, he was forwarded to Constance loaded with chains.[3]

Meanwhile the Council, unaware of his arrest, had cited him to appear within fifteen days

[1] *Doc.*, 90. [2] Hardt, iv. 103, 684, 760.
[3] Hardt, iv. 134, 216.

(April 17), and forwarded him a safe-conduct against violence. This did not protect him, as the document expressly stated, against legal proceedings for heresy.[1] On May 2nd and 4th the citation was again published, and his trial ordered to be commenced.[2] On May 23rd the prisoner arrived, and was taken at once to the Franciscan convent, 'patiently carrying in his hand his iron fetters and long chain.' There a tumultuous congregation of the Council greeted his arrival. 'Jerome,' said a bishop, 'why did you flee? and when cited, why did you not appear?' 'When you were at Paris,' cried Gerson, 'you disturbed the University with your false arguments, especially in the matter of Universals.' 'At Heidelberg,' cried another, 'you painted up a shield comparing the Trinity to water, snow, and ice.' This shield he had called 'the shield of faith.'[3] Jerome's replies were sharp and ready, but were drowned in the roars of 'Burn him! Burn him!' 'If you wish my death,' he replied, 'so be it, in God's name.' 'Nay,' replied Hallum, who was less led astray by the passions of the Nominalists,—'nay, Jerome; for it is written, "I will not the death of the sinner, but rather that he be converted and live."' So Jerome was carried 'by night' to a

[1] Hardt, iv. 106, 134, 147, espec. 687.
[2] *Ibid.* 140–2, 148–9.
[3] *Ibid.* 218, 506.

dungeon in the cemetery of St. Paul, and chained hand and foot 'to a bench too high to sit on.' For two days he was left to starve on a scanty supply of bread and water, until Peter Mladenowic found his prison and bribed the gaoler to give him better food. The darkness and foul surroundings soon brought on a sickness, from which with difficulty he recovered.[1]

On his partial restoration the Inquisition began his examination.[2] More learned and skilful than Hus, Jerome's defence was brilliant, his tongue bitter. But he lacked the moral strength which made Hus a hero. The strain of his imprisonment told also fatally upon this restless knight-errant. He grew fitful—'now wishful to stand fast in his obstinacy, now desirous to be wholly converted.'[3] At last, on September 11th, overcome by the pleadings of men who were anxious to save the Council from the odium of another blaze, Jerome consented to recant. So he read a paper which he had written with his own hand:

'I say truly, that when the thirty articles against Hus were presented to me, at first blush I would not believe they were his. But after I had been shown the truth by many illustrious

[1] Hardt, iv. 217–8.

[2] July 19, Hardt, iv. 481. In the Church of St. Paul.

[3] *Doc.*, 596.

doctors, I owned that they were his. Still, to remove every scruple from my mind, I obtained a book of Hus which I recognised as written in his own hand. In this I found all the aforesaid articles, exactly as they are entered in his condemnation. Therefore I aver that they were rightly condemned. Although I was Hus's intimate friend, yet now that I have learned the truth from his own writings, I am unwilling to be a friend of his errors. So I approve the condemnation both of Wyclif and Hus.'[1]

The form of the recantation shows the anxiety of the Council to use Jerome as a means for stilling the storm already gathering in Bohemia. Only the week before, 452 nobles of Bohemia and Moravia had met at Prague, reprobated the death of Hus, protested against the imprisonment of Jerome, and sworn that 'they would protect the humble and devout preachers of the law of Christ even to the shedding of blood, all fear and human edicts to the contrary being thrown behind our back.'[2] So on the 12th of September Jerome was forced, 'under fear of burning,' to write to his friends in Bohemia repeating again his former condemnation of Hus.[3] This retraction Jerome was forced once more formally to read in a public session of the Council on Sept. 23, the same

[1] *Doc.*, 597; Hardt, iv. 497, and more formally (Sept. 23), *ibid.* 499.

[2] Sept. 2, 1415. *Doc.*, 580–90; cf. *ibid.* 590–5, on Sept. 5.

[3] *Doc.*, 598. See also Reichental, p. 79, Vrie in Hardt, i. (1) 171–5.

session which issued the condemnation against all those who should upbraid Sigismund for his breach of the safe-conduct. Nor did the Nominalists forget to include in the recantation a condemnation by Jerome of the Realist theory of Universals, 'painted shield' and all. For the Parisian and German masters a victory in the Schools was only second in importance to the uprooting of heresy itself.[1]

Jerome had expected by his recantation to obtain his freedom. He had been promised that at anyrate he should exchange his prison for some Swabian monastery. But the Inquisition never released its victims. Jerome was taken back to his dungeon, in spite of the wiser counsels of Zabarella and D'Ailli. Palecz and Michael the Pleader were not satisfied. They persuaded Gerson, in whose hostility we see the *odium philosophicum* of the Schools, to call the attention of the Council to the unsatisfactory nature of Jerome's recantation.[2] So on Feb. 24, 1416, a new Commission was appointed to hold further Inquisition[3]. On April 27th they brought in their report, valuable still from its full account

[1] Hardt, iv. 499–513, 521, 688.

[2] *Ibid.* ii. pt. 4, iv. 533, Oct. 29, 1416.

[3] *Ibid.* iv. 616, the Patriarch of Constantinople and Nicholas Dinkelsbühl.

of the wanderings and adventures of this restless scholar. In the case of Hus there were books and sermons; for Jerome his enemies could only rake up every foolish or thoughtless act which might possibly be laid to his charge, or in which his friends had borne a hand. The Inquisitors concluded by asking permission to apply to Jerome a judicious system of starvation; 'the said Jerome,' it appears, 'was gorging himself' on his prison fare. 'On this account the Inquisitors feared that the Holy Spirit would find no place for repentance. Did not Christ fast for forty days before His Passion?' If starvation would not suffice, 'since Jerome is a layman, and always walks about in lay dress and with a long beard,' perhaps 'under torture' he might be forced to answer a plain Yes or No to the questions. If he still refused, he could then be handed over to the secular arm. The request, apparently, was not granted; so on May 9 the Inquisitors brought in a second report, going over the same ground as the first.[1]

The growing troubles in Bohemia led the Council to accede to Jerome's request that he

[1] Hardt, iv. 634–91. I have alluded before (p. 167) to the unsatisfactory dates of this report, in which Jerome seems to have led the poor Inquisitors a sad dance. For the second report, *ibid.* 732, the Inquisitors were partly changed.

might have a public hearing. He promised that he would then answer categorically their questions. So on May 23 Jerome was brought before the Council. The scene which followed has become historic through the vivid description written to Aretin by his friend Poggio Bracciolini, the famous Florentine scholar, who was attending the Council as Apostolic Secretary. Poggio had but recently returned from the Baths of Zurich (Baden), and from writing a shameless letter on the licence which there prevailed. That anyone should die for a religious belief seemed absurd to a man who in his fifty-fifth year could leave the woman with whom he had lived, and who had borne him fourteen children, that he might marry a young girl of noble family.[1] But the eloquence of Jerome strangely moved him. 'I confess,' he begins,

'that I never saw anyone who in oratory approached nearer to the admired eloquence of the ancients. It was marvellous to see with what words, what arguments, what action, and with what confidence he met his adversaries. How sad that so noble a genius should have turned to the study of heresy, if indeed the accusations brought against him are true. But of that it is not my business to judge. I content myself with the opinion of those who are held wiser than I.'

Poggio and Jerome are typical of the contrasted forces of the new age at the dawn of which they

[1] For Poggio, see Symonds, *Renaissance*, *passim*.

were standing—the renewed classic heathenism and indifference which triumphed in Italy, and the religious fervour which roused Germany to the new life of the Reformation.

But to return to Poggio's description. A long list of charges was read out, and Jerome was called upon to answer them one by one. 'He refused, claiming that he should first state his own case.' When this request was denied,

'standing in the midst of the assembly: "What iniquity," said he, "is this, that I, who have been kept in close confinement—in filth, dung, fetters, and need—for 340 days, while my adversaries have always had your ears, should now be refused an hour in which to defend myself! . . . You are men, not gods; mortals, not eternal; liable to stumble, err, be deceived, seduced. . . . I, indeed, whose life is at stake, am a man of no repute, but I do not speak for myself alone. It seems to me a shame that so many wise men should act unjustly against me, and do even more harm by their example than the act itself."'

He was heard, says Poggio, with murmurs. 'The articles against him were then read one by one from the pulpit, and he was asked what he had to say to each.' Poggio was amazed at the readiness and brilliance of his replies; 'if indeed he believed what he said, no just cause, I will not say of death, but of offence, could be found in him.' Some of his answers tickled Poggio's sense of humour, or gratified his dislike of the

clergy. One of his accusers charged him with saying,

'"After consecration the host remains bread." "Yes, at the baker's," he answered. A Dominican was bitterly attacking him; "Hold your tongue, you hypocrite," he replied. To a third, taking an oath on his conscience: "That," he said, "is the surest way to deceive." One of his chief accusers he never addressed save as "Dog" or "Ass."'[1]

Three days later Jerome was brought up again.[2] With some difficulty he obtained permission to speak. His address charmed Poggio by its appeal to the past: 'his sweet, clear, resonant voice' moved all. He first ran through the persecutions of the philosophers, from Socrates to Boethius. Then he turned to the examples of the Jews: Moses, Joseph, Daniel, Susanna, Stephen, 'who was put to death by a college of priests.' This done, he pleaded for liberty of discussion, 'not to corrupt the faith, but to open out the truth.' Such was his eloquence that all were moved to mercy. They expected that he would either retract or seek for pardon. But Jerome, to the grief of Poggio

[1] The modern must not be misled. Such adornments of debate were reckoned of no account. Parliamentary language had yet to be invented. Hus was no exception, and Wyclif was a past-master in invective.

[2] For those trials, etc., in addition to Poggio's letter (on which, see *supra*, p. 264), see *Mon.*, ii. 349–357; Hardt, iv. 748–773; Vrie in Hardt, i. (1) 202.

and others, went on to assert that he was guilty of no error. As for Hus, 'that good, just, and holy man' whom they had condemned to the flames,

'he had said nothing against the Church of God, but against the abuses of the clergy, the pride, scorn, and pomp of the bishops. The wealth of the Church should be spent first of all on the poor and on strangers, secondly on buildings. To that good man (Hus) it seemed a wrong that it should be squandered on harlots and banquets, horses and hunting dogs, splendid robes, and other things unworthy of the religion of Christ.'

As Poggio remarked, Jerome 'seemed anxious for death.' There was but one issue possible, for Zabarella and others tried in vain 'to bind him to the right way.' After four days' delay Jerome was brought into the cathedral for sentence (May 30, 1416). The Bishop of Lodi again preached 'a beautiful sermon.' 'You were not tortured,' said the orator, addressing his victim. 'I wish you had been, for it would have forced you to vomit forth all your errors. The rack would have opened the eyes which guilt has closed.' The sermon ended, Jerome 'stood up on a bench and replied,' summoning his judges to the judgment-seat of God.[1] 'He had never,' he said,

'grieved over any sin so much as he grieved over his recanting the doctrines of those holy men, Wyclif and Hus, and thus

[1] For the supposed prophecy of Jerome, see Appendix R, p. 365.

consenting to their death. One article only he excluded which Wyclif had held. I believe, said he, that on the altar the bread becomes the real body of Christ. In all other matters I agree with Wyclif and Hus, who were holy, just, and good men.'

Sentence was at once pronounced against the 'said Jerome, as a withered and dry shoot no longer abiding in the Vine.' A tall paper crown with red painted devils was then brought out.

'When Jerome saw it, he threw his cap among the prelates and clasped it, saying: "My Lord Jesus Christ, when about to die for me, wore a crown of thorns on His head. I will gladly bear this for His dear love."'

So, chanting the Creed and Litany,

'with cheerful countenance and even eager looks, Jerome passed out to his death. No Stoic ever met death with so constant and brave courage. When he came to the place of execution, he took off his garments, knelt down, and on bended knees clasped the stake to which he should be bound. When the torch was applied, he began a hymn. When the executioner was preparing to light the faggots behind his back, so that he might not see it: "Come in front," he said, "and light it before my face. If I had feared death, I should never have come hither."'

When he had finished chanting the Creed, and the hymn "Salva festa dies," 'My beloved children,' he said, speaking to the crowd in German, 'as I have chanted, so I believe.' As the flames and smoke wrapped him round, they heard him say, first in Latin then in Czech:

'Into Thy hands, Lord, I commend my spirit.' They were his last words. When the body 'together with the beard'—that offending beard! —had been consumed to ashes, his clothes were burnt, and the dust thrown into the Rhine. A few months later and Bohemia was in revolt. The great struggle had commenced, the last chapter of whose varying fortunes was the Thirty Years' War.

We must bring our story to a close. We have entitled our work *The Dawn of the Reformation.* From some aspects the title seems a misnomer. The dreams of Dante and Marsiglio had vanished, the revolt of Wyclif and Hus was crushed, the reform projects of D'Ailli, Gerson, and Hallum ended in the fiasco of Constance. If the Church was to be reformed from within, never had Europe such an opportunity as in the closing years of the fourteenth and the opening of the fifteenth centuries. The value of the period lies in the demonstration it gives that reform from within was impossible. Where Constance had failed, rougher methods and a more revolutionary spirit might possibly succeed, and would find their justification in past failures. But the time, though at hand, was not yet. The invention of printing, the New Learning, and last, but not least,

the disdain of Europe for a Papacy which used its recovered opportunities to set over the Church worldlings like Sixtus, Alexander, and Julius, were the new factors which were needed to prepare Europe for the more drastic revolution of Luther and Calvin. The chance which Constance had presented would never recur again. But it is precisely in the greatness of the opportunity missed, and in the failure of all reformers, that the student of Church History will discern the supreme importance of the age of Wyclif and Constance.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A.

Dietrich von Niem.

The Life of Niem has been written by Erler, *D. v. N.*, 1887, with useful "Urkunden." A brief abstract is given in Creighton, i. 365–8. For bibliography, see Finke, *F.Q.*, 133 n. Niem was a German of Paderborn, for many years (1372–1416) a member of the Curia. He held a number of preferments before his (doubtful) election as Bishop of Verden (Erler, *op. cit.* 96–104). The value of his works lies in his personal knowledge as an eye-witness, and the testimony of one in the inner circle to the rottenness of the system. His will was proved at Paderborn, Oct. 10, 1418. Date of his death is not known, but he was alive on March 15, 1418. He left some goods at Constance; 'if they can be sold for a fair price,' the receipts were to be given to a hospital in Hamelen.

In addition to the works dealt with in Appendix B, Niem wrote—

(*a*) *Nemus Unionis*, 1408, a collection of documents rather than a history, very confused in arrangement. It deals with the events between 1406–8. First published by Schardius, Basel, 1566, after its suppression.

(*b*) *Libri III. de Schismate*, on which see p. 2.

In addition, he wrote also a *Stilus Palatii Abbreviatus*, ed. Erler, 1888, a sort of guide to practice in the Curia; and the works against John xxiii. in Appendix C.

APPENDIX B.

On Certain Works of Niem ascribed to Gerson and D'Ailli.

§ 1. I have ascribed the *De modis Uniendi ac Reformandi Ecclesiam* to Niem. The treatise is printed in Hardt, i. (5) 68–142, who ascribes it (followed by Neander, ix. 136; Milman, viii. 270, and others) to Gerson. That Gerson could never have written it is evident from its glorification of the Empire (see *supra*, p. 56 n.), and the evident signs that it was written by a member of the Curia. Its ascription to Gerson has unfortunately obscured in many writers the appreciation of Gerson's real character. Its authorship is examined at length by Finke (*Forschungen und Quellen*, 132–149), who decides for the view, first put forth by Lenz, that it was written by Niem. Whoever its author, Hus was burned for writings scarcely more scathing than this. See especially pp. 75–80, 86–7, 96, 105, 123, 136, 137–40. The date when it was written is fixed as 1410 by a reference on p. 118.

Finke, following Schwab, *Gerson*, 481 ff., also assigns to Niem the tract *De Necessitate Reformationis* (printed Hardt, i. (5) 277–309; also *Op. Gerson*, ii. 885–902), commonly assigned to D'Ailli. Such ascription upsets all historical perspective, as Hardt (i. 484) perceived. Its date, after 1413, is fixed by its famous reference to Hus's *Ecclesia*, *op. cit.* p. 307, and *supra*, p. 184. It is largly an epitome of the *De Modis*, brought up to date, with the emphasis of the fact that 'the heresy in Bohemia cannot be rooted out unless the Roman Curia be first led back to its old praiseworthy customs' (*op. cit.* 308). The conclusion of this treatise, missing in Hardt, has been printed by Finke, *F. Q.*, 267–278. The last sentence is conclusive against D'Ailli: 'So ends this work. Glory to Christ, who illuminates every man coming into this world, and gives intelligence, as He will, not to those alone who have studied at Paris, but even elsewhere. So the reverend master, T. Niem.'

A third tract of lesser importance, of which Niem was probably the author, though again assigned to D'Ailli, is the *De Difficultate Reformationis*, written in 1410. In Hardt, i. (6) 255–68, evidently (cf. p. 262) written by a member of the Curia.

APPENDIX C.

The Writings of Niem against John xxiii.

The current estimate of John xxiii. is chiefly based upon the writings of Niem. These are *Invectiva in Diffugientem Concilio Johannem XXIII.* (in Hardt, ii. 296–330), evident on the surface as a polemical screach; and his *De Vita ac fatis Constan. J. XXIII. usque ad Fugam.* (in Hardt, ii. 336–459; also in Meibom, *Script. Rer. Germ.*, i. 5–52, Frankfort, 1620. I have cited from Hardt). On p. 397, with John's flight the style changes from a history to a diary. Two other treatises in Hardt, *De Modis Uniendi* (i. pt. v. pp. 68–142) and *De Necessitate Reformationis* (i. pt. v. pp. 277–309), usually assigned to Gerson and D'Ailli, and full of bitter attacks on John (cf. pp. 127, 135, 306–9, *et passim*), are also by Niem (see Appendix B, *supra*). We are thus really reduced to Niem and the charges of the Council of Constance, together with a few incidental references, of which Creighton, i. 385, draws attention to some less adverse to John.

Niem's charges seem to me exaggerated. What, for instance, are we to make of the following: 'Publice dicebatur Bononiæ quod ipse ducentas maritatas, viduas et virgines ac etiam quam plures moniales corruperat, ejus ibidem dominio perdurante' (Hardt, ii. 339). Strange, if true, that no other writer mentions it. Or again (*ibid.* 349), according to Niem, John killed so many people at Bologna 'that if they were all alive, they would scarcely be able to dwell with convenience in any small town.' Of Niem's hatred I have given an instance on p. 18. This and others would lead me to discount largely the details

he gives of John's wickedness, more especially as they were written after John's fall.

The statement of Hus about John (*Doc.*, 60) is often cited as proof of the charges. But it was not written until after John had excommunicated Hus (1413); previous to this, Hus shows no signs that he knew he was dealing with a moral monster. *Doc.*, 18–20. *Doc.*, 125, written after John's fall, cannot be counted as evidence.

There remain the charges at Constance. Their value is lessened by several circumstances. (*a*) The same men who now formulated them had formerly elected him. See *supra*, p. 79. (*b*) John had to go; and to make this deposition legal, either heresy or some dreadful charge must be found. The Council first tried to bring in heresy; 'sæpius coram diversis prælatis dogmatizavit vitam eternam non esse, animam hominis cum corpore extingui' (art. 68, Hardt, iv. 208). When this was read out in the Council, Fillastre protested that there was not a shadow of evidence (*F.Q.*, 177). So the clause was dropped; but what, we may ask, becomes of the worth of the evidence of the 'many prelates'? Let anyone look at the evidence, or rather the absence of evidence (Hardt, iv. 253–5), and ask what an English judge would say to it. Such methods satisfied the Inquisition; their absence of value is pointed out by Protestant historians in the case of Hus, etc. I simply desire to point out their absence of value for John, especially when we remember the importance to the Council of making John into a monster. Even as it was, in spite of their catalogue, we learn that many believed that John was not lawfully deposed. The majority of the accusations, in fact, could have been brought against most of the popes. Something special, therefore, must be tacked on.

No doubt John was a thoroughly bad man. But I incline to caution (with Creighton, i. 344–6, 385 n.; Pastor, i. 191 n.; Hefele, vii. 130 n.; as against Milman, Wylie, and the majority of writers). For the charges against John, see Hardt, iv. 196–208, 228–255, less accurately printed in Mansi, xxvii. 662 ff.

APPENDIX D.

The Election of Urban VI.

A full list of the sources for this election will be found in Creighton, i. 363–5, and in the clear analysis of Hefele, vi. 628–59. I add the ones I have examined, in addition to Niem, which seem to me of most importance:—

A. For Urban—

(*a*) Mansi, xxvi. 312, the letter sent by the cardinals to Avignon, and the Cardinal Geneva's statement. The last is the sort of thing that could be invented, but the first seems to me impossible to get over. Also in Ciac., ii. 626–7.

(*b*) Mansi, xxvi. 328, the dying statement of the Cardinal Tebaldeschi.

(*c*) The striking testimony of the French Cardinal d'Aigrefeuille in Pastor, i. App. 14.

(*d*) The letter of St. Catherine to the Italian cardinals, the argument of which seems unanswerable (Pastor, i. 131, from *Lettere*, iv. 150–161).

(*e*) The statement of Urban's case sent to the King of Castile (Mansi, xxvi. 348–60), which seems to me a clear and accurate document.

B. For Clement—

(*a*) The two lives of Gregory xi. in Baluze, *Prima Vita*, i. 443–51, and the *Secunda Vita*, i. 457–78, followed by Milman. Its graphic style points to an eye-witness.

(*b*) The declaration of the French cardinals (Baluze, ii. 821–35).

The statements of the lawyers, John da Lignano and Baldo of Perugia (in Mansi, xxvi. 318–20, 631–57, 613–31), are of interest rather for canonists than historians.

APPENDIX E.

St. Bridget and St. Catherine of Siena.

The story of these two saints would take us too far afield. They are interesting studies in a long line of prophetesses, from Hildegard downwards, whose place and importance in the medieval Church cannot be exaggerated. St. Bridget was the wife of a great Swedish noble, Ulf Gudmarson, to whom she had borne eight children. She came to Rome first in 1346, then in 1350, and remained there until death (July 23, 1373). Her body was then carried to Wadstena in Sweden, all cities *en route* being summoned to allow free passage for the horses and baggage (Greg., vi. 456, n. 2). On October 7, 1391, she was canonised by Pope Boniface IX.; but as the Schism was then in progress, it was repeated February 1, 1415, at Constance.

As the foundress of an order, she is of some interest to Englishmen. Her convent at Wadstena was begun in 1369. It was a double monastery of the old Anglo-Saxon type, familiar to us in Caedmon's Whitby. The rules were of the strictest, nine services a day, a code of signs during the long silences, and 'moderate' castigations every Friday. (Full details in Aungier, *Hist. Syon Monastery*, London, 1840.) In 1406 negotiations were begun for establishing the order in England. Hence arose the great Briggitine Convent at Sion, near Isleworth, which Henry V. founded in memory of his parents, the revenues of which at the Dissolution amounted to £1944. This convent is one of the few that has maintained a continuous existence, first at Dermond in Flanders, then and now at Chudleigh in Devonshire (Gasquet, *H. VIII. and Eng. Mon.*, ii. 476).

For the life of Bridget, see *Acta Sanctorum* (October 8), vol. iv. pp. 495 ff., which is full of the usual incredible stories and miracles. The Swedish life by F. Hammerich (Trans. German, 1872, by Michelsen) is the best. There is a French monograph by the Comtesse de Flavigny, *St. B. de Suède*, 1892. Her Revelations, published with the Pope's sanction, have been frequently edited, most recently by A. Heuser, *Revel. Selectae*,

1851. There is also an English translation, *Certayne Revilacyons of St. Brigitte*, by Th. Godfrey [London ; ? 1535]. Her life by Gascoigne (*Collect*, 53, 156, 165, 170) seems lost. It was left by his will to the library at Sion. Nothing that Wyclif or Hus ever said could exceed in bitterness some of her denunciations ; cf. *Revel.*, Lib., iv. c. 33, 37, 142, and c. 144, a vision of judgment on the soul of a dead pope 'whom you had known,' whom she saw surrounded by 'black Ethiopians with pincers and other instruments of torture.' Such passages are left out in Heuser, *op. cit.*, and Manning, *Select Revelations*, 1892, books only written for edification. The Revelations, the major part of which is exposition, show wide reading and knowledge of Scripture.

St. Catherine of Siena is better known to English readers than the Swedish saint, through the full biography written by Mrs. Josephine Butler (several editions), a book which atones for its many historical blunders by its sympathy. Uncritical Lives of St. Catherine abound. De Malan's *Histoire de St. C.*, 2 vols. 1846, and A. T. Drane, *St. C.*, 2 vols. 1887, may be mentioned. Her *Letters* (in Italian) have been edited by Tommaseo, 4 vols., Florence, 1860. A critical study in English of the medieval prophetesses is a want. The best is Döllinger, *Prophecies and the Prophetic Spirit*, trans. Plummer, 1873.

We add here Bridget's prophecy of Urban v.'s death—

> Si contigerit ipsum redire ad terras ubi fuit electus Papa ; ipse habebit in brevi tempore unam percussionem, sive unam alapam, quod dentes sui stringentur sen stridebunt. Visus caligabit et fuscus erit, et totius corporis sui membra contremiscent.

APPENDIX F.

The Fate of the Cardinals and of Adam Easton.

The end of the cardinals is uncertain. The accounts vary and lead to doubt [see Niem, *Sch.*, 110, Erler's note]. They witness, even if in part fables, to the popular terror and hatred of

Urban, and to some atrocity. Only one of the victims escaped, an Englishman, 'on the intercession of Richard (II.) of England, whom Boniface IX. restored to his dignity. See Niem, *Sch.*, 103 ; Gobelin Persona, *Cosm.*, vi. 81 ; Wals., ii. 123, 197. Adam Easton, the released Englishman, was not, as Niem calls him, the Bishop of Hereford, but a canon of Salisbury. See Creighton, i. 97 n. See also Eubel, *Hierarchia Cath.*, 23.

In Ciaconius, ii. 648, there is a life of Easton. He was a monk of Norwich, of poor parents, and was said to know Greek and Hebrew. According to Eubel, *op. cit.* 23, he died Sept. 20, 1397, and is buried in St. Cecilia in Rome, of which church he was probably cardinal. On his tomb (Ciac., *loc. cit.*) he is called 'Episcopatus Londiniensis perpetuus administrator' (*i.e.* I assume, corresponding proctor in the Curia), which gave rise to the error of Baluze, ii. 985, that he was Bishop of London. In Ciac., ii. 649, there is a list of his "works." Some are evidently titles of his library (*e.g.* 'Textum Hebraicum Bibliorum'), which includes seven others in Hebrew. Whether any of his writings survive I know not.

APPENDIX G.

Nicholas de Clémanges.

"Clémanges," says Creighton (i. 375), "is an instance of a man who ruined his reputation by identifying himself with the unsuccessful party." A Life will be found in Hardt, i. (2) 71–84. He was born at Clémange, near Chalons. In 1393 he became rector of Univ. Paris, and in 1395 secretary to Benedict XIII. He afterwards hid himself in the Carthusian monastery of Valprofonds, then at Fontaine-du-Bosc. He was there during Pisa and Constance, and thence wrote the letters noted above, pouring contempt on the Conciliar Idea. He died at a date unknown, but somewhere before Basel (1439). His letters were edited by Lydius (Frankfort, 1613), according to Hardt, i. (2) 82, very badly. His *De Ruina Ecclesiæ* (1401), often

inaccurately called *De Corruptu Ecclesiæ Statu*, was printed at Leyden, 1613, and is in Hardt, i. (3) 1–52, and Brown, *Fascic.*, ii. 555–69. As Milman owns (viii. 316 n.), "it must be read as a declamation," and, like other similar works, should be used with discrimination. It has been translated into French by Aignan, *Bibl. Étrangère d'histoire*, iii. 1–89 (Paris, 1823).

I add here the passage to which reference was made on p. 26. Clem., *De Ruina Eccles.*, c. 42 (Hardt, i. (3) 46): 'Quid Clemente nostro, dum advixit, miserabilius? Qui ita se servum servorum Gallicis principibus addiceret, ut vix minas et contumelias, quæ ille quotidie ab aulicis inferebantur, deceret in vilissimum mancipium dici. Cedebat ille furori, cedebat tempori, cedebet flagitantium importunitati, fingebat, dissimulabat, largiter promittebat, diem ex die ducebat, his beneficia dabat, illis verba.'

APPENDIX H.

On the Works of Milicz and Janow ascribed to Hus.

The work of Milicz, *De Antichristo*, or, as it should properly be called, *Anatomia Membrorum Antichristi*, is printed in *Mon. J. Hus*, ed. 1558, i. pp. 336–368, together with a preface to Martin Luther by its first editor, Otho Brunfels, 1524 (i. pp. 332–336). The treatise was obtained from the library of Ulrich von Hutten (*ibid.* i. 334). Luther replied, accepting the dedication: 'Gaudeo J. Hus, vere Martyrem Christi, nostro seculo prodire, hoc est, recte canonisari, etiam si rumpantur Papistæ' (*ibid.* i. 336). The *Anatomia* is a curious, though in nowise violent, production: De vortice Antichristi, de naso, de oculis, de ore, de lingua, de saliva, etc. A fragment will suffice to show the drift of all.

De Collo Antichristi. Collum situatum est inter caput et corpus. Sic isti inter papam et communem populum, etc. (i. 351). De visceribus Antichristi. Per ipse autem religiosi in secta Antichristi possunt designari. Et hoc ideo primo quia sicut per viscera cibus superfluus a stomacho mittitur, ita per

false religiosos omnis error in Antichristi infimos, etc. Tertio quia sicut ventositates intra viscera exortæ, sonum magnum efficiunt. Sic religiosi vento cupiditatis, etc.!

It is curious that such a treatise should have been gratefully accepted by Luther, as by Hus. Taste was not critical. That it was against Antichrist was enough.

The margins of the edition of 1558 (not from Brunfels) are most misleading. They exaggerate wherever possible its anti-papal tendencies (see espec. i. 363*b*). The student should further note that the edition of 1558 is not without interpolations, which perhaps indicate the date of the MSS. from which Brunfels printed his edition. See, for instance, i. 359*a*: 'Quantum sanguinis effusionem procuravit in hoc regno et in terris circumjacentibus Cruciata Papalis, et quantum in aliis regnis et provinciis, norunt et noscunt experti,' etc. So also i. 365*b*: 'Ut patet per cruciatam contra regnum hoc erectam.'

Another work of the Milicz school is the *De Regno, Populo, Vita et Moribus Antichristi*. This, again, has been wrongly ascribed to Hus, and is printed *Mon.*, i. 368–75. It seems to have been written some time after 1395 (*Mon.*, i. 375), and contains nothing except what is customary with that school. A thorough examination of the medieval literature of Antichrist is a great lack. The absence of this makes it difficult to say to whom we should ascribe the authorship of the two fragments, *De Mysterio Iniquitatis Antichristi* and *De Revelatione Christi et Antichristi*, found by Brunfels in a mutilated state, and printed *Mon.*, i. 451–469. See *supra*, p. 93; *infra*, Appendix J.

Janow's great work, *De Regulis vet. et novi Testamenti*, still exists only in manuscript save for the fragment, *De Sacerdotum et Monachorum Abominatione*, wrongly ascribed to Hus, and printed *Mon.*, i. 376–471. A lengthy analysis is given by Neander (ix. 280–335), who, however, if we may judge from Janow's retraction (*Doc.*, 699–700; cf. Loserth, 62, n. 1), rates his character as a Reformer somewhat too highly. [The first two articles of the Retraction deal with images; third, with relics; fourth, 'quod homo sumendo digne corpus Christi fit mysticum

membrum Christi'; fifth, 'quod homines et præsertim laici non sunt inducendi ad quotidianam communionem.'] "In his works," writes Neander (ix. 277), "we may find the reformatory ideas which passed over from him to Hus. . . . Of Hus it may be said with more truth that he fell behind Mathias of Janow, than that he passed beyond him." Loserth has shown that these statements are complete mistakes (cf. Loserth, *W. and H.*, xxi., xxvi. n. 2 and 3, 45–50).

APPENDIX J.

On Certain Sermons commonly ascribed to Hus.

Brunfels also published (and subsequent editors have followed) '*Twenty-Eight Sermons found in the Library of Hutten*,' which he ascribed to Hus (see *Mon.*, ii. 54–82). These sermons are really founded on the *Anatomia Membrorum Antichristi*, to which they make constant reference, and in fact embody large fragments. (Compare ii. 59*b* with i. 341*b*; ii. 60*b* with i. 342*a*; ii. 62 with i. 342–3, and so throughout.) As to the authorship of these sermons, it is difficult to speak with any certainty. The student who examines even cursorily the structure of these sermons will note at once that they are easily divided into two parts, but little related together. The first part of each sermon is generally good, often evangelical. Then at the end are tags and references to the *Anatomia*. If these tags and references are separated, we may well regard the rest as genuine fragments of sermons by Hus, or by preachers of his school. Some of them, at anyrate, should be so regarded. As regards Sermon I., this is certain from its incorporation of fragments of Wyclif's *De Christo et Antichristo* (see Loserth, *op. cit.* pp. 220–1). The manifest affinity with the *De Regno, Vita et Moribus Antichristi* (see *supra*, p. 356) would point to a common authorship.

The Twenty-Eight Sermons, as they are at present printed, are not without interpolations which would indicate the date

when the MS. was written. See, for instance, ii. 77*a*, 'Qualiter Wickleph et alios multos per annos plurimos non permittunt sepelire, ipsos continue hereticantes,' which would fix the date later than 1415 if genuine. So, lower down on the same page, 'O quanta hodie corpora sanctorum et mores eorum, videlicet Wicklephistarum, quasi occisa jacent in plateis magnæ civitatis Pragensis, et non sinuntur sepeliri, etc. Et quando reputantur aliqui per illos devicti, qui prius cruciaverunt eos et eorum fictitiis erroribus contradixerunt gaudent,' etc., which would point to some date later than 1420. But except this one sermon, No. 23, they are almost colourless—except for references to Indulgences. Compare also the interpolations in the *Anatomia, supra*, p. 356. This fact, along with the common origin in the library of Hutten, would point to one and the same scribe.

APPENDIX K.

St. John Nepomucen.

The legend of this saint has been carefully examined by A. H. Wratislaw; first in his *Enquiry into the Canonisation of St. J. N.*, a short 10-page tract written in 1866, afterwards expanded and corrected into his *Life, Legend, and Canonisation of St. J. N.*, 1873. [My references are to this last.]

The saint's real name was John Welflin of Pomuk or Nepomuky. In 1373 he was chief clerk in the chancery of the Archbishop of Prague, and we have records of many loans lent by him (p. 4). He was ordained between 1378 and 1380, and in this last year became rector of St. Gallus, in the Old Town, by paying 14 sexegenæ of Prague groschen to the Apostolic See (pp. 5–6). In 1387 he became Doctor of Canon Law, and from 1390–3 was a very active Vicar-general. In 1393 he was drowned (as stated, *supra*, p. 113) by Wenzel's orders, March 20, 1393. So much for the real history.

The first point about the familiar legend is that it gives (*Breviary, loc. cit.*) the wrong date, May 16, 1383, and forgets

that Queen Joanna died six years before N.'s drowning. This seems to have been a clerical error of Wenzel Hajek of Liboczan (1541). As regards the seal of confessional: the origin of this tale is very early. Palacky has shown (p. 22) that it is first found in the *Liber Augustalis* of Thomas Ebendorfer of Haselbach (*d.* 1464), who, however, does not vouch for it—'ut fertur.' This was copied by Paul Zidek (p. 25) in his *Spravovna* (1471), and mixed up with many inaccuracies. The modern legend is, however, really the work of Dlauhowesky of Longavilla, who wrote in 1670 a romance, swearing that he had obtained it from ancient MSS. He did not print it himself, but handed it to Balbin, the Jesuit historian (p. 43).

Balbin's *Vita J. Nepomucen*, 1725, Vienna, is a remarkable book. The source of its influence lies in its many pages of beautiful woodcuts, the effect of which must have been considerable. The student anxious to trace how the Jesuits worked should not neglect it. Its first effect was N.'s canonisation, March 29, 1729. But the romance of Balbin, though now part and parcel of the Breviary of an infallible Church, contains less than usual of real history. John Nepomuk, in fact, must be classed among the saints of whom Luther speaks: 'coluntur ficti et poetici, quales sunt Georgius, Christophorus, qui numquam fuerunt.' [*Mon. Hus*, Pref.]

The choice of this common and worldly cipher to oust not only Hus—who died for truth—but St. Wenzel, St. Adalbert, or John of Jenzenstein—they were too national for the Jesuits!—was an insult to the Czechs, and the apotheosis of a lie.

APPENDIX L.

Prague in the Time of Hus.

Some knowledge of Prague will better enable the student to follow the Chronicles. At this time Prague consisted of five separate communities. They were:

(i.) The Wyschehrad, or original citadel of Prague, on the site of the castle of the foundress of the Bohemian monarchy. Its walls were destroyed during the Hussite war. In the time of Hus there was a great monastery there.

(ii.) The Hradschin, or capitol, with the Cathedral of St. Veit (founded 1344 and still unfinished) and the Palace of Charles IV. ; also the archbishop's palace, where the books were burnt. At the foot of the Hradschin lay

(iii.) The Kleinseite, or Small Quarter. Crossing the famous bridge, we come to

(iv.) The Old Town, in the time of Hus chiefly in the rule of the Germans. Here were the Teyn Church, the Carolinum, the Bethlehem, and the old churches of St. Gallus and St. Michael. The Old Town was almost surrounded—moat and walls only between—by the

(v.) New Town, founded by Charles IV., and in the hands of the Czechs. Its Rathhaus was built in 1370.

For further information, see authorities cited, p. 98 n., and especially Lützow ; *Prague* (Medieval Towns Series).

APPENDIX M.

The Date of John's Flight.

The accounts differ greatly, and the confusion is worse because of current ecclesiastical methods of reckoning time. Add also that the constant committees of the nations had very uncertain secretaries, because they were so largely informal. The various dates are as follows :

March 17, in *Doc.*, 541 ; March 19, "source" quoted and followed by Pastor, 197 n. ; March 20, Cerretanus in Hardt, iv. 60 ; March 21, early in the morning, Fillastre in *F.Q.*, 169 ; March 21, in the evening, Niem in Hardt, ii. 313, 398, so Hardt, iv. 59. To add to the confusion, the Vat. MS. (Finke, *F.Q.*, 265) gives March 21 as the date of Sigismund's visit to the sick John, and the flight as late that night. In the official

letter of the Council (Hardt, iv. 108–112; Lab., xvi. 82–6) the date is left uncertain,—'duobus vel tribus diebus abinde prolapsis,'—though the date of his arrival at Schaffhausen is given as March 21. But in the letter to Ladislaus of Poland (Hardt, iv. 133) the Council settled down to Fillastre's date, the early hours of March 21, 'post mediam noctem.' All things considered, this seems correct. Later is impossible if the letter of John from Schaffhausen (Hardt, ii. 252), written March 21, is to be got in.

If my reasoning is correct, Reichental's account, followed by Creighton, i. 327, and most historians, will need revision. If the tournament took place *after the flight*, it would lead to delay in the discovery of the flight, and explain the diverse accounts. The Pope, at anyrate, contrived his flight with skill; and perhaps this is the only certain fact.

APPENDIX N.

Certain Matters of Dispute concerning Constance.

(*A*) *Is Constance a General Council?*

The Romanists are divided. Some, *e.g.* Pastor, following Phillips, i. 198–9, reject *in toto*, but overlook, as Hefele points out (i. 59, Eng. Trans.), the express declaration of its ecumenical character made by Eugenius iv. (July 22, 1446, and often, *e.g.* Lab., xvii. 292, 298). Hefele accepts Sessions 41–5 (those after the election of Martin v.) and the decrees of the earlier sessions approved therein 'conciliariter, etc.' (see *infra*), of which, however, no list is given. [See Hefele, i. 50–2, 58–9, 63, Eng. Trans.] The Gallicans, of course, pleaded that the whole Council is ecumenical.

Personally I find it difficult to know what standard to apply. Judged by Canon law, Phillips and Pastor would seem to be right. But this is to give Rome the decision of its own case. This initial difficulty of standard shows, however, that Ecumenical

Councils are a part of the machinery of the early Church discarded by the progressive providence of God.

(*B*) *The Supremacy of a Council over a Pope.*

I quote, first of all, the exact words of the famous decree of the fourth Session (*supra*, p. 224) from Hardt, iv. 89 :—

'Et primo, quod ipsa, synodus in Spiritu Sancto legitime congregata, generale Concilium faciens, Ecclesiam Catholicam militantem repraesentans, potestatem a Xto immediate habeat ; cui quilibet cujuscunque status vel dignitatis, etiamsi papalis existat, obedire tenetur in his quae pertinent ad fidem, et extirpationem dicti schismatis.'

There are two points of dispute. Are the words 'ad fidem' part of the original decree, or did it refer solely 'to the extirpation of the present Schism'? Hefele, vii. 103, and Creighton, i. 386, decide in their favour. Creighton, it is true, states that the words do not occur in the first edition of the *Acta*, published at Hagenau in 1500 (*supra*, 191 p.). But in the copy in the Aberdeen Univ. Library they certainly do occur, and have been pencilled out by a zealous Romanist.

The second part is more important. Ultramontanes maintain that the decree is not valid, because it was not ratified by Martin v. (see *supra*, p. 257). This, of course, is to give Rome the decision of its own case. But even then, it might well be claimed that the words were ratified. Martin's words were as follows :

'Quod omnia et singula determinata, conclusa, et decreta in materia fidei per praesens sacrum concilium generale Constantiense conciliariter, tenere et inviolabiliter observare volebat et numquam contravenire quoquo modo ; ipsaque *sic conciliariter facta approbat et ratificat, et non aliter*, nec alio modo' (Lab., xvi. 748). The student should note that in Hardt, iv. 1557, there is a difference in the last sentence, which reads : 'conciliariter facta approbat Papa, omnia gesta in Concilio conciliariter circa materiam fidei et ratificat,' etc.

The words are ambiguous. What do they mean? Was the decree of the fourth Session among those ratified? No, says

Hefele (vii. 368, cf. i. 50), "conciliariter, *i.e.* nicht tumultuariter, wie die Constanzer Dekrete der 3–5 Sitzung." But the more natural interpretation would be, as Creighton points out, *conciliariter*, as opposed to *nationaliter*—formal sessions as opposed to mere congregations and committees. If so, the decree was ratified. In any case, since the Vatican Decrees, it is of interest only as a fossil relic of an extinct Conciliar Idea. But, like the Ichthyosaurus, it once had life.

APPENDIX P.

The Affair of Petit.

Milman (viii. 304–6) severally denounces the Council for refusing to condemn plainly the doctrines of Petit. He seems to me to forget the circumstances of the age, and look at the matter through modern spectacles. Petit's doctrine of the lawfulness of tyrannicide was not new. It formed the subject of a (lost) work by John of Salisbury, *On the End of Tyrants*, whose arguments, so far as they have come down to us, are really identical with Petit's. [Poole: *Med. Thought*, 238.] We must not forget that this was the age of the Italian tyrants, whose illegalities and cruelties were only tempered by fear. If the Church condemned Petit too unambiguously, almost the sole restraint of the times on tyranny would be removed. The Council was still shuddering at the horrors of men like Bernabo of Milan [see Symonds, *Age of the Despots*, 108–9; or Niem, *De Schismate*, p. 127], or of Ezzelino da Romano of Padua (1259), the Nero of the Middle Ages.

This affair of Petit, with Gerson's wearisome harangues, is dealt with at great length in Gerson, *Op.*, vol. v., as also in Lenfant, *C.C.* The perusal even of this latter abbreviated account will not repay the reader. He will do well to content himself with the index or diary of the matter which Dupin (*op. cit.* v.) has provided. (Copied in Labbe also.) Fillastre scarcely mentions the matter.

APPENDIX Q.

The Safe-Conduct of Hus.

This safe-conduct, preserved by Mladenowic, has been often printed. See *Doc.*, 237–8; Hardt, iv. 12; very incorrectly *Mon. Hus.*, i. 16. See also Hefele, vii. 221; Höfler, *Ges.*, ii. 263.

As the matter is of importance, I copy the structure of the safe-conduct, *i.e.* leaving out all the adjectives and customary amplifications:

'Honorabilem Magistrum J. Hus . . . quem etiam in nostram et sacri imperii protectionem recepimus et tutelam, vobis omnibus . . . recommendamus affectu, desiderantes, quatenus ipsum, dum ad vos pervenerit, grate suscipere, favorabiliter tractare, ac in his, quae celeritatem et securitatem ipsius concernunt itineris . . . promotivam sibi velitis et debeatis ostendere voluntatem, nec non ipsum . . . per quascunque portus, pontes, civitates (amplified) . . . sine aliquali solutione . . . tributi . . . transire, stare, morari et redire libere permittatis sibique et suis, dum opus fuerit, de securo et salvo velitis et debeatis providere conductu, ad honorem et reverentiam nostrae regiae majestatis. Spires, Oct. 18, 1414.'

Lenfant's inference (i. 39) from the phrase 'honorabilem magistrum' of Sigismund's esteem, etc., may be dismissed at once as beside the mark. Such phrases are usual. Nor can we lay stress, with Neander (x. 458 n.), on the 'redire libere.' This, again, is a customary phrase. Berger has shown this in his *Johannes Hus and König Sigmund*, Aügsburg, 1871. [See the Appendix, pp. 177–208, for a well-arranged selection of similar passages. For the common phrase 'transire et redire,' cf. 181*g*, 183*g*, 185*g*, 189*g*.] But Berger has gone too far in claiming (92–3, 109) that the safe-conduct was a passport merely. Sigismund certainly did not look on it as such, and the Council never pleaded this convenient excuse in their answer to the Bohemian protest of May 12, 1415 (*Doc.* 256, 261, 549, 552–3;

Hardt, iv. 189, 209), the very basis of which protest was that this was no mere passport.

We add here the words of the Council on the matter. See p. 287. 'Cum tamen dictus Joannes Hus fidem orthodoxam pertinaciter oppugnans, se ab omni conductu et privilegio reddiderit alienum ; nec aliqua sibi fides aut promissio de jure naturali, divino, vel humano, fuerit in praejudicium catholicae fidei observanda' (Lab., xvi. 291 ; Hardt, iv. 521).

APPENDIX R.

The Supposed Prophecies of Hus and Jerome.

The supposed prophecies of Hus at his death concerning Luther may be dismissed,—'hodie Anserem uritis, sed ex meis cineribus nascetur cygnus, quem non assare poteritis,'—though repeated by historians from the time of Luther. It is really a combination of (1) *Doc.*, 39 : 'Prius laqueos, citationes et anathemati Anseri paraverunt, et jam nonnullis ex vobis insidiantur : sed quia Anser animal cicur, avis domestica, suprema volatu suo non pertingens, eorum laqueos rupit, nihilominus aliae aves, quae verbo dei et vita volatu suo alta petunt, eorum insidias conterent' (written by Hus, autumn 1412), and (2) his Czech letter of June 24, 1415 (*Doc.*, 134) : 'Atque dispergentur ex eo concilio per terram, ut iconiae, et ubi hiems advenerit, cognoscent quid aestate perpetraverint,' with (3) the words of Jerome : 'Ac appello ad celsissimum simul et aequissimum judicem Deum omnipotentem ut coram eo centum annis revolutis respondeatis mihi' (*Mon.*, ii. 352*b*). But these words of Jerome would themselves seem to have been doctored, for in Hardt, iv. 757, they read 'speraret tamen in Deum quod una vice post hanc vitam haberent videre Hieronymum eos praecedere et eos omnes ad judicium vocare,' an interesting example of the change of the indefinite in prophecy into the definite to suit a later event.

INDEX OF NAMES

N.B.—*Names of authors quoted are not given, except where some information is given about them. For the more important names, see Tables of Contents.*

"Abraham," ii. 132.
Adria, kingdom of, ii. 23.
Æneas Sylvius, ii. 89, 208 n.
Ailli, Peter d', ii. 40, 60, 61, 63, 210–1, 216, 218, 223, 236, 242, 243, 251, 253, 294, 301, 306, 308, 317, 320, 328, 337, 348.
Albik, Archbishop, ii. 155.
Albornoz, i. 70; ii. 6, 10.
Alexander v., ii. 72, 75–7, 78, 138, 141.
Ammonius on Lollards, i. 286.
Andrews, St., Univ. of, ii. 40 n.
Angelo, Castle of, ii. 32, 37.
Annates, i. 29; ii. 236 n. 243.
Anne of Bohemia, i. 204; ii. 121, 176 n.
Anselm, i. 147.
Antichrist, i. 174 n.; ii. 104–5.
Antioch, Patriarch of. *See* Cramaud.
Antonin, ii. 74.
Aquila, Bishop of, ii. 341.
Aquinas, Thomas, i. 132, 180–1; ii. 309.
Aragon, ii. 238, 241, 248–9.
—— Ferdinand of, ii. 287.
Arezzo, Bruni, ii. 46 n., 47, 79.
Arlberg, ii. 193.
Arundel, Archbishop, i. 113, 256; ii. 68.
Aston, i. 233.
Austria, Albert of, ii. 207.
—— Frederic of, ii. 194, 221, 227.
Avignon, i. c. i.; i. 68, 291.
—— Palace of, i. 20, 68.

Badby, i. 260.
Ball, John, i. 169.
Barbara of Hungary, ii. 207.
Bari, John de, ii. 17.
Baxter, Margery, i. 281.
Beaufort, Bishop of Winchester, ii. 250–3, 254 n., 255.
Benedict xii., i. 34, 69.
—— xiii., ii. 15, 39–40, 45, 49, 66–8, 196, 233–5.

Bernard, St., i. 49.
Bethlehem, Chapel of, ii. 119, 120, 172–3, 184, 271, 297–8.
Bible in M. A., i. 203–4, 302. *See* Wyclif.
"Bibrach, Doctor," ii. 273.
Black Death, i. 58–9, 115, 145.
Blackfriars, Synod of, i. 188.
Boccaccio, i. 11, 22.
Bois, Peter du, i. 26.
Bonaventura, i. 93.
Boniface VIII., i. 41 ; ii. 261.
—— IX., ii. 36–8, 40, 67.
Boreham, John, i. 272.
Bradwardine, i. 131, 142–6.
Brandenburg, ii. 198.
Bridget, St., i. 23 ; ii. 7, 62, 352–3.
Brod, Andrew of, ii. 109, 127, 145, 177, 182, 308, 310 n.
Broglie, John, ii. 323 n.
Bruges, i. 157.
Brute, Walter, i. 235, 253, 275, 278.
Bubwith, i. 62 ; ii. 212 n.
Burton, Abbot, i. 22.
Butillo, ii. 32, 35.

"CAIN," i. 178 n.
Canon Law, i. 55.
Canterbury, Warden of, i. 110–1, 295.
Cardinalis, John, ii. 146, 277, 279, 297.
Castile, ii. 241, 248–9.
Catherine of Siena, i. 23, 28, 70 ; ii. 8, 12, 18, 20–1, 32, 352–4.
Catrik, ii. 246–7.
Celestine v., i. 95.
Cesena, Massacre of, ii. 24.
Charles IV., i. 69 ; ii. 98–102, 111, 204, 289.
Charles v., ii. 20, 23, 293.
Chlum, John of, ii. 187, 267, 270, 274, 276, 277, 280, 297–8, 299, 310, 314, 321, 326.
Christan, Prachaticz, ii. 123, 127 n., 151 n., 167, 183, 294 n., 297, 327.
Chrysolore, Manuel, ii. 202.
Circumspecte Agatis, i. 42, 55.
Citto di Castello, Bishop of, ii. 304.
Cividale del Friuli, ii. 66.
"Clem," ii. 330 n.
Clémanges, Nich., i. 60, 291 ; ii. 75, 82, 354.
Clement v., i. 26, 32, 65, 96.
—— VI., i. 27 ; ii. 289.
—— VII., ii. 15, 19, 21, 24–5, 39.
Clifford, Lewis, i. 249.
Clux, Hartung, ii. 156, 246 n.
Colet, i. 286.
Colonna. *See* Martin v.
Conciliar Theory, ii. 53–60.
Concordats, ii. 261–2.
Conrad of Waldhausen, ii. 102.
Constance, Bishop of, ii. 276, 283.
—— Council of. *See* Vol. ii., Table of Contents ; ii. 53 n., 54.
—— description of, ii. 197–203, 275.
Cossa. *See* John XXIII.
Courtenay, i. 163, 165, 170–1, 209.
Cracow, Matthew of, i. 291 ; ii. 58.
Cramaud, ii. 215, 226 n., 236.
Craw, Paul, i. 228.
Croaria, Jerome of, ii. 191.
Cyril, ii. 95–6.

DAMASCENUS, John, i. 186.
Dancers, i. 9.

Dante, i. 13, 15, 19, 67, 72, 74–7.
Didaco, ii. 279–80.
Dolein, Stephen, ii. 89, 142, 161 n., and *passim*.
Dominic, John of Ragusa, ii. 48 n.
Dresden, Peter of, ii. 310.
Duba, Wenzel of, ii. 267, 270, 296, 326.
Duns Scotus, i. 133–7, 180–2, 185.
Durazzo, Charles of, ii. 29, 32, 33.

Easton, Adam, ii. 34, 354.
English at Constance, ii. 213 n.
—— statistics at Constance, ii. 239–40.
Ernest of Prague, ii. 88, 101, 103.
Eternal Gospel, i. 93, 97.
Eugenius iv., ii. 48 n., 361.
Execrabilis, i. 33.
Extortions, Papal, ii. 43.

Faenza, ii. 10.
Falstaff, i. 267–8, 308.
Faulfiss, i. 241 ; ii. 122 n., 135, 139 n.
Ferrer, Boniface, ii. 67, 74.
—— Vincent, ii. 234.
Fillastre, ii. 190, 195, 216, 217, 223, 225, 228, 237, 239, 245, 249, 251, 255.
Fitzralph, i. 128–30, 159 n.
Flagellants, i. 8 ; ii. 37 n.
Flemyng, i. 244–5 ; ii. 323.
Florence, ii. 11, 13, 69, 71.
Forester, John, ii. 242.
Fourteenth century, Character of, i. 6–11.
France, Growth of, i. 24–7.
Franciscans, Spiritual, i. 89, 102.
Frederic i., ii. 199.
—— ii., ii. 286, 290.
—— of Nuremberg, ii. 198, 228, 315, 319.
Frequens, ii. 250.
Friars, i. 5, 56, 123–30, 169 ; ii. 76.

Gamaleon, ii. 14 n.
Gasquet, Dr., Theory of, i. 194 ff.
Gaunt, John of, i. 155, 156, 164, 168 ; ii. 26.
Gelasius i., ii. 308.
Geneva, Robert of. *See* Clement vii.
Gentian, Benedict, ii. 215 n.
Germany, Inquisition in, ii. 291.
Gerson, i. 15, 16 ; ii. 42, 52, 61–6, 70, 73, 77, 165, 192, 216, 238 n., 243, 259, 266, 308, 310, 334, 337, 348.
Golden Bull, ii. 99, 208.
Goose, John, i. 284.
"Gospel of the Silver Marks," i. 36.
Gottlieben, ii. 230, 283.
Gratian's Decretum, ii. 308.
Gregory ix., i. 91.
—— xi., i. 37, 70, 158, 160, 165, 168, 172 ; ii. 7–14, 291.
—— xii., ii. 45–8, 50, 66, 68, 84, 126, 136, 196, 232–3.
Grosseteste, i. 15, 29, 30, 38–40, 48, 52, 106, 149 ; ii. 132 n.
Guilds, Influence of, i. 269–71.

Hadrian iv., ii. 75.
Hallum, Bishop, ii. 69, 71, 211–5, 218, 236, 242, 246, 247, 328, 334.
Hardt, Hermann v., ii. 190 (in notes, *passim*).

Hawkwood, ii. 6, 10, 24.
Hedwig of Poland, ii. 125, 160 n.
Heidelberg, ii. 230.
Henry IV. (England), i. 47, 230, 256 ; ii. 68.
—— V. (England), i. 261 ; ii. 84, 239 n., 238–41, 246 n., 247.
—— VII. (of Germany), i. 74–5.
Hereford, Nicholas of, i. 160 n., 188, 194, 199, 234.
Heretico Comburendo, i. 259, 306–7.
Hildebert of Tours, i. 49.
Hildebrand, i. 78.
Hohenstaufen, i. 18.
Horn, John, i. 212.
Hun, Richard, i. 280.
Hus, i. 57, 196, 226–7, 241, 264. *See* Table of Contents, Vol. ii.
Husinec, Village of, ii. 117 n.

Imitatio Christi, ii. 65.
Immaculate Conception, ii. 60, 62.
Indulgences, ii. 118, 158–60, 163.
Innocent III., ii. 287, 288 n.
—— IV., i. 30, 31, 40.
—— VI., i. 70.
—— VII., ii. 38–9, 44.
Internationalism, i. 25.
Islip, i. 110, 295.

JACOBELL of Mies, ii. 148, 179, 307–11.
Jandun, John of, i. 80.
Janow. *See* Mathias of.
Jenzenstein, John of, ii. 111 n., 113, 359.
Jerome of Prague, ii. 122, 125, 143 n., 144 n., 165–9, 199, 297, 317, 333–45.
Jesenic, John of, ii. 81, 82, 127 n., 174, 178 n., 180–1, 297.
Joachim di Fiori, i. 92.
Joan, Pope, ii. 181.
Joanna of Naples, ii. 20, 26.
John XXII., i. 32, 33, 67, 70–1, 87, 96–8, 99, 102 n.; ii. 60, 77.
—— XXIII., ii. 70, 77–86, 139, 146, 150, 193, 195–6, 216–22, 228–31, 275, 276, 280, 299, 300 n., 306, 320, 349–50, 360.
Jubilees, ii. 35, 37.

KAUFHAUS, Constance, ii. 197–8, 252–3.
Kemp, John, i. 61.
Kempis, Thomas, ii. 65.
Königsaal, Tombs at, ii. 297 n.
Kyle, Lollards of, i. 228.

LADISLAUS (of Naples), ii. 70, 77, 80, 83, 85, 193.
—— (of Poland), ii. 160, 169.
Langenstein, Henry of, ii. 58, 190, 266.
Langham, Archbishop, i. 110.
Langland, William, i. 51.
Lateran, ii. 5.
Latimer, Sir Thomas, i. 248, 249.
Leipzig, Univ. of, ii. 116, 128.
Leitomischl, Bishop, ii. 179, 312.
Lenfant, ii. 4, and in notes *passim*.
Lewis the Bavarian, i. 71–4, 99, 100.
—— Count Palatine, ii. 315, 330.
Limousins, ii. 15.
Lincoln, Parliament of, i. 41.
Lithuania, ii. 167.

Lodi, ii. 84.
—— Bishop of, ii. 329, 342.
Lollards and the Bible, i. 286.
—— Derivation of, i. 303.
—— Schools of, i. 309.
—— *See* Table of Contents, Vol. i.
Lombard, Peter, ii. 296.
Louis of Anjou, ii. 29, 77, 80.
Lübeck, Bishop of, ii. 276, 304.
Luna, Peter. *See* Benedict, 23.
Lupac, Martin, ii. 168.
Luther and Hus, i. 227; ii. 93–4, 117, 159, 160, 263, 293, 323 n., 332 n., 356.
Luxembourg, House of, ii. 208.
Lyndwood, i. 55, 196 n., 197, 205, 206, 301.

MALATESTA, Charles de, ii. 232.
Malmesbury, Monk of, i. 37, 61.
Man, Thomas, i. 288.
Marino, Battle of, ii. 32.
Marriage, Lollards and, i. 272 n.
"Mars," ii. 215, 236.
Marsh, Adam, i. 39, 126.
Marsiglio (of Padua), i. 16, 72, 80–8; ii. 59.
Martin (Hus Scholar), ii. 271, 327.
Martin v., ii. 149, 150, 222, 255, 257, 362.
—— Election of, ii. 253–4.
Martyrs, The Three, ii. 170–1.
Mathias of Janow, ii. 88, 106–9, 309 n., 356.
Medici, Cosimo dei, ii. 203, 231.
Merton, i. 58, 293.
Methodius, ii. 95–6.
Michael de Causis, ii. 171, 274, 280, 295, 301, 304, 305, 310, 316, 324.
Michael of Cesena, i. 72, 98, 100–2.
Milicz of Kremsier, ii. 88, 102–6, 355–7.
Miliczin, Nicholas, ii. 174 n.
Milton, on Wyclif, i. 222.
—— and Bradwardine, i. 146.
Mladenowic, ii. 92, 178, 264, 277 n., 311, 314, 315, 318, 335.
Monarchia, De (Dante), i. 74–7.
Monasticism, i. 56 ff.
Money, Worth of, i. 28.
Montague, i. 249, 250.
Montfort, Simon de, i. 106.
More, Sir Thomas, on Bible, i. 197.
Mortmain, i. 42.
Mühldorf, i. 73.
Mungyn, i. 196.
Mystery Play at Constance, ii. 242.

NATIONS, Vote by, ii. 218 n., 237.
Nazareth, Bishop of, ii. 268, 292, 294, 312.
Nepomuc, John of, ii. 113, 358.
Niem, Dietrich of, i. 34; ii. 2, 56–9, 184, 192, 347–50, and *passim* in notes.
Nominalism, ii. 63, 100, 123, 334, 337.
Northampton, Lollards at, i. 251.
Nuremberg, Hus at, ii. 273–5.

OCKHAM, William of, i. 72, 81, 87–9, 100–2, 137, 292.
Oldcastle, i. 262 ff., 307.

Orsini, Napoleon, i. 66.
Oxford, Council of, i. 205, 242.
Oxford Univ.: Colleges at, i. 119.
—— Fall of, i. 189–90.
—— Friars at, i. 123–8.
—— Lollards at, i. 229 ff.
—— Morals of, i. 296.
—— Numbers at, i. 122, 297.
—— Testimonial of, to Wyclif, i. 241, 242; ii. 135, 157.

Palecz, Stephen, ii. 145, 146, 153, 164, 174, 182, 268, 279, 304, 325.
Paris, Matthew of, i. 30, 48.
Paris, Univ. of, ii. 43–4, 49, 60, 68, 81, 84. *See* Gerson.
Parliament, Clergy at, i. 299.
—— Illiterate, i. 246.
Parma, John of, i. 90, 92, 93.
"Pastors," ii. 10.
"Pater," ii. 316, 323.
Pavia, Council for, ii. 260.
Peasants, Revolt of, i. 168 ff.
Peckham, Archbishop, i. 35.
Pelayo, Alvaro, i. 23, 32, 291.
Peniscola, ii. 234–5.
Perpignan, Council of, ii. 50, 67.
Petit, John, ii. 64, 363.
Petrarch, i. 21, 291; ii. 5, 8.
Philargi. *See* Alexander v.
Philip vi., i. 28.
Pisa, Council of. *See* Vol. ii., Table of Contents; ii. 196, 233 n.
Pluralities, ii. 19.
Poggio, ii. 264, 339–342.
Præmunire, i. 43, 47, 53, 54.
Prague, City of, ii. 183, 359.
—— Synods of, ii. 108, 178, 267.
—— Univ. of, ii. 98–9.
—— —— Numbers at, ii. 116.
—— —— Schism of, ii. 125–8.
Provisions, i. 30.
Provisors, i. 43, 46, 51, 121.
Purvey, John, i. 198, 199, 201, 206, 236–7, 254, 277, 305.

Ranconis, Adalbert, ii. 116, 121.
Realism, i. 139–41; ii. 100, 124, 145.
Reichental, ii. 191, 201–2, *et passim* in notes.
Renan, quoted, i. 1.
Rich, Edmund, i. 120.
Rienzo, Cola di, i. 79.
Repyngdon, i. 160 n., 188, 229 ff.; ii. 48 n., 68, 323.
Reseby, John, i. 227.
Robert the Gaoler, ii. 295.
Rochetaillade, John of, i. 155 n.
Rokyzana, John, ii. 293.
Roman Council, ii. 81–3.
"Rome-runners," i. 50.
Rupert (Antikaiser), ii. 70, 110, 120.

Safe-Conduct (of Hus), ii. 268, 270, 274, 275, 280–3, 284–92, 364–5.
Sagan, Ludolph of, ii. 58, 89, *et passim* in notes.
Sandale, John of, i. 45.
Sawtry, i. 257 ff., 276, 306–7.
Schism, Great, i. 173. *See* Vol. ii., Table of Contents.
—— Causes of, ii. 22–4.
—— Effects of, ii. 26–32, 41–3.

Scholasticism, i. 148–9. *See* Ockham, Duns, Wyclif.
Seculars, Rise of, i. 56–60, 131.
Sharp, Jack, i. 282.
Sigismund, ii. 81, 83–4, 112, 194, 196, 204–9, 213, 220, 227, 233, 241, 245–50, 255, 256, 258, 265–7, 270, 275, 281, 282 n., 283, 286, 288–9, 292, 312, 317, 319, 321–2, 327, 329.
Sion Monastery, ii. 352.
"Slaughter, The Great," i. 116.
Smith, William, of Leicester, i. 254.
Solidarity of Europe, i. 18 ; ii. 23.
Sophie of Bohemia, ii. 113, 149.
Spenser and his Crusade, i. 211, 255, 258 ; ii. 3, 29–31.
Stanislas (of Znaim), ii. 131, 145, 146, 150, 164, 174, 180–2.
Stekna, John, ii. 109 n.
Stitny, Thomas, ii. 119, 186.
Stock, Lambert, ii. 235 n.
Stokes, John, ii. 155–8, 177, 246 n.
—— Peter, ii. 155.
Swinderby, i. 251.

Tebaldeschi, ii. 16.
Telesphorus, ii. 141.
Templars, Trial of, i. 65 ; ii. 322 n.
Teyn Church, ii. 102, 105.
Thirteenth Century, Character of, i. 1–7.
Thorpe, William, i. 10, 113, 233, 238–9, 256.
Tiem, Wenzel, ii. 159, 161.
Tissnow, Simon of, ii. 143–4, 180.
Transubstantiation, Theories of, i. 180–3. *See* Wyclif and Hus in Tables of Contents.
Trevisa, John of, i. 198.

Ullerston, Richard, ii. 214.
Urban v., i. 69 ; ii. 5–7, 104.
—— vi., i. 172, 211 ; ii. 16–22, 26, 30, 32–6, 121, 351.
Utraquism, ii. 308–9, 324.

Vas Electionis, ii. 77, 239.
Vicars, Stipends of, i. 59.
Vienna, Univ. of, ii. 166, 167, 169 n., 265, 266 n.
Villani, i. 32.
Virgilius, Polydore, i. 225.
Visconti, ii. 75, 112.
Vrie, Dietrich, ii. 73 n., 190, 192, 205 n., 235, 264, *et passim* in notes.

Waldensians in Bohemia, ii. 291.
Wenzel, ii. 70, 110–4, 120, 126–8, 149, 150, 153, 204–5.
Wesley on Wyclif, i. 207 n.
White, Richard, i. 274.
Wilsnack, ii. 132.
Woksa (of Waldstein), ii. 149, 168.
Wyche, Richard, i. 248, 284, 309 ; ii. 147–8.
Wyclif. *See* Vol. i., Table of Contents. Also *see* Lollards, Hus ; also ii. 17, 29, 111, 124, 129, 142–4, 157, 166, 341 n.
—— and Biblemen, i. 208 ff.
—— and the Bible, i. 192 ff., 301 ; ii. 176 n.
—— and Bohemia, i. 225–6. *See* Hus.

Wyclif, Character of, i. 212 ff.
—— Chronology of, i. 295.
—— and the Church, i. 175–8, 299.
—— and Confession, i. 191.
—— on Disendowment, i, 156–7, 170.
—— and English Language, i. 202–3, 207.
—— and the Friars, i. 178.
—— Hus and Constance, Dependence on, ii. 130, 155 n., 162, 176–7, 184, 269.
—— and Indulgences, i. 176 n.
—— on Lordship, i. 159–63.
—— and Oxford, i. 120 ff., 167, 187.
—— and the Papacy, i. 172–5.
—— Realism of, i. 182–6, 214; ii. 100.
—— cited to Rome, i. 211, 304.
Wyclif, the Three Wyclifs, i. 292–4.
—— and Transubstantiation, i. 179 ff., 289.
—— Works of, i. 303.
—— Works of, burned, i. 243; ii. 82, 138–41, 157, 179, 307.
Wyclif's *Wyckett*, i. 279.
Wykeham, William of, i. 59, 163, 189.
Wyngfield, ii. 197 n., 240, 259.

Zabarella, ii. 59, 84, 212, 223–4, 253, 301, 319, 328, 337, 342.
Zbinek, Archbishop, ii. 110, 124, 126, 130–7, 144, 150, 152–4, 167.
Zdislaw of Zwierzeticz, ii. 143 n., 149.
Zepekow, ii. 139.

PRINTED BY MORRISON AND GIBB LIMITED, EDINBURGH.

H. B. WORKMAN'S CHURCH HISTORIES.

THE CHURCH OF THE WEST IN THE MIDDLE AGES.

From Gregory the Great to Clement the Fifth (1314)

By HERBERT B. WORKMAN, M.A.

Two Volumes. Small crown 8vo, **2s. 6d.** *each.*

SOME OPINIONS OF THE PRESS.

"Seems to me singularly successful in grasping principles and arranging details around them."—THE LATE BP. CREIGHTON.

"Fascinatingly written. There is not a dull page in Mr. Workman's volume."—*Spectator.*

"In his general treatment Mr. Workman is most successful. He is throughout well informed and fair minded."—*Athenæum.*

"This informing and stimulating volume. We promise that no intelligent reader will go to sleep over Mr. Workman's pages."—*Critical Review.*

"This most interesting volume. . . . A worthy guide for the studies of years to come."—*Methodist Recorder.*

"Accurate, patient, and loving study, embodied in a form which all can understand and enjoy."—*Methodist Times.*

"Based upon a wide and honest study."—*Pilot.*

"Marked by the same qualities of conscientious reading and careful workmanship as we have already noticed in the first volume."—*Guardian.*

"Well proportioned, interesting, and living."—*Literary World.*

"A book of remarkable interest, which should be useful as an introduction to one of the most interesting periods of history."—*Scotsman.*

LONDON: CHARLES H. KELLY, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

CHARLES H. KELLY'S NEW BOOKS.

By WILLIAM L. WATKINSON.

THE BANE AND THE ANTIDOTE, and other Sermons. By WILLIAM L. WATKINSON. Second Thousand. Post 8vo, gilt top, 3s. 6d.

"Every new volume of sermons published by Mr. Watkinson excels the last in freshness, in richness, and in power. In the present volume the eloquent Methodist preacher is at his best."—*Glasgow Herald.*

"Mr. Watkinson's sermons possess permanent qualities of freshness of view, depth of thought, beauty of expression, and of illustration."—*Methodist Weekly.*

"First and foremost, Mr. Watkinson is a preacher. . . . He appeals to the conscience, the enlightened self-interest of the unconverted; he evinces a rare power of reading the human heart, of tracing and exhibiting its hidden processes and motives."—*Methodist Recorder.*

STUDIES IN CHRISTIAN CHARACTER, WORK, AND EXPERIENCE. By WILLIAM L. WATKINSON. First and Second Series. Foolscap 8vo, cloth, gilt top, 2s. 6d. each. Nine Thousand Volumes of this work have been sold.

"Studies of great pith and moment."—*Expository Times.*

"There is wisdom and beauty in the pages, which are rich in illustrative points, drawn from science and art, history and experience."—*Christian.*

"These volumes are not to be criticised, but to be read and enjoyed."—*Evangelical Magazine.*

"Will do much to enrich the experience, inspire the heart, and direct the life of believers."—*Christian Guardian.*

By WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A.

A MISSION TO THE MYSORE. With Scenes and Facts illustrative of India, its People, and its Religion. By Rev. WILLIAM ARTHUR, M.A. With Introduction, Notes, and Appendix by Rev. HENRY HAIGH. Crown 8vo, gilt top, 5s.

By JOHN EDWARDS.

NINETEENTH CENTURY PREACHERS AND THEIR METHODS. By Rev. JOHN EDWARDS. Post 8vo, gilt top, 2s. 6d.

By J. A. CLAPPERTON, M.A.

THROUGH ROMAN SPECTACLES. By Rev. J. A. CLAPPERTON, M.A. Illustrated. Small crown 8vo, 1s. 6d.

A NEW HISTORY OF BRITISH METHODISM.

THE HISTORY OF METHODISM. By JOHN FLETCHER HURST, D.D., LL.D.

GENERAL VIEW OF CONTENTS—

England before the Revival.	**Wesleyans after Wesley.**
The Oxford Methodists.	**Scions and Secessions.**
The Wesleys and their Helpers.	**The Forward Movement.**

In Three Volumes, royal 8vo. Copiously Illustrated, and superbly printed on high-class paper.

Price TWENTY-FIVE SHILLINGS the Set of Three Volumes.

LONDON: CHARLES H. KELLY, 2, CASTLE STREET, CITY ROAD, AND 26, PATERNOSTER ROW, E.C.

270.5
W892
v. 2

RAYMOND H. FOGLER LIBRARY
DATE DUE

DEC 1 9 1968

NOV 1 1 1970

UNIV OF MAINE
3 7550 00963954 4